

leadership of their party in the Congress and to the country generally what they believe a proper bipartisan approach should be. On these ticklish problems which I have out-

lined, they have not done so yet. Their failure is likely to create major difficulties for the enactment of sound laws facing up to these problems. These difficulties could re-

sult in defeat for much of the civil rights program. If it does so, regardless of the protestations, the responsibility will be the administration's.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 13: 10: *Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.*

O Thou God of all grace, we are fervently praying that our beloved country may be safeguarded from the devastating blight of atheism and materialism, from the corrupting influences of greed and selfishness, and from the debasing moods of prejudice and hatred.

Grant that all the barriers which stand between the members of the human family may be broken down and may our democracy cause its radiant splendor of good will and brotherhood to find lodgment in every heart and every home.

May there be none in our social order who are aliens and outcasts to the blessings of freedom and justice, and show us how we may help them to cultivate and enjoy those blessings to the utmost by coordinating them with self-discipline.

Inspire us to seek for one another whatever is noblest and most worthy in human aspiration and achievement, and in all our relationships may there be that cardinal virtue of love which is the fulfillment of Thy law.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 628. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945;

S. 1512. An act to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; and

S. 1627. An act to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the

House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, July 18, after all legislative business is concluded, I may address the House for a period of 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to eulogize Eugene T. Kinnaly, who has been a faithful servant here for 45 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AIRPORT CEREMONIES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this morning 20 commercial airliners with a capacity of over 1,500 passengers remained stacked in flight for over 20 minutes at the National Airport while commercial operations were suspended for state ceremonies attending the departure of the distinguished leader of a friendly free world nation.

While the need for state ceremonies is well recognized, why should these functions take place at the already overloaded National Airport? Andrews Air Base is conveniently nearby with all of the resources for ceremonial pomp.

The stacking of commercial aircraft under the best conditions and controls imposes an unnecessary added risk to the passengers as well as the aircraft which must remain suspended in space for the duration of such ceremonies.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-

committee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS OF RECIPIENTS OF OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would permit recipients of old age assistance under social security to earn an additional \$50 a month, or a total of \$1,800 a year, before they are disqualified in any way from receiving social security benefits. I feel the advance in the cost of living makes this change in the basic law a necessity so that our senior citizens can earn sufficient sums of money that, together with social security benefits, will enable them to live in the dignity which they so well deserve.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard thousands of times from the Gospel "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

At the Clerk's desk is my discharge petition to bring before the House a resolution providing a constitutional amendment that would permit prayer in schools and public places. I have asked the Members to sign that petition. I have sent letters to all the Members and shall continue to do so, and shall continue to exhort them to agree that we should give to God the things that are God's, the right to be heard in this Nation, as was stated in our Declaration of Independence and all of our public declarations through our history.

I agree that Members will not sign petitions having to do with things that are Caesar's, but I feel that when it comes to the area of Almighty God, no man can use the excuse that he does not sign discharge petitions. If we want to preserve our spiritual heritage in this Nation, the time to do so is now and not wait for more litigation before the Supreme Court, that is being prepared, to take from our currency and coins, "In

God we trust," and from our pledge of allegiance to the flag, "one nation under God," or to take our chaplains away from our armed services.

I say that the time to do it is now. We have waited 1 year for the committee to act on this resolution. They have not acted. I say we must do it now.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 551)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 17, 21, 25, 27, 34, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 9, 11, 13, 15, 23, 24, 32, 36, 38, 45, 47, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,152,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$89,235,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$37,691,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$58,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "two hundred and thirty-three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said

amendment insert "\$27,124,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,566,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$29,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,136,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "one hundred and twenty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$29,404,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$615,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,832,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,589,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,243,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted

by said amendment, insert "one hundred and three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,858,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$147,312,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$962,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,893,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$63,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "one hundred and thirty-six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$58,960,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, and 10.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public land management

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$44,152,500 for management of lands and resources instead of \$43,292,500 as proposed by the House and \$44,652,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$250,000 for reseeding of burned areas; \$110,000 for rehabilitation of public land in Butte and Lawrence Counties, S. Dak.; \$200,000 for rehabilitation in the Big Horn Basin, Wyo.; and \$300,000 for cadastral surveys in Alaska.

The conferees are agreed that the directive included in the report of the Senate committee with regard to surveys of Alaska land selections made under the terms of the Alaska Statehood Act (Public Law 85-508) will be satisfied by surveys of the exterior boundaries of full townships (even if composed of as many as four land selections) with monumentation at an average of 2 miles around the perimeter.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$760,000 for public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$89,235,250 for education and welfare services instead of \$88,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$90,381,500 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House bill consists of a decrease of \$300,000 for survey of Indian education and increases as follows: \$600,000 for educational assistance, facilities, and services; \$132,000 for relocation and adult vocational training; \$172,000 for maintaining law and order, and \$281,250 for 1964 pay act costs. The conferees direct that the proposed survey of Indian education be conducted within available funds.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$37,691,300 for resources management instead of \$37,239,300 as proposed by the House and \$38,147,900 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$50,000 for maintenance of roads used by school buses; \$250,000 for repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities; and \$152,000 for 1964 pay act costs.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$58,300,000 for construction instead of \$55,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,448,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is expected that the agency will undertake with the amount provided the construction of the complete budgeted program and in addition make provision for the following: replacement facilities for the Rosebud School Mission, S. Dak., \$4,000,000; assistance to the public school district at Ignacio, Colo., \$219,000; assistance to Newtown, N. Dak., Public School District No. 1, \$450,000; assistance to the Grants, N. Mex., Municipal School District No. 3, \$370,000; and for a jail at the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., \$128,000.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

The conferees are in agreement that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should explore very carefully the return to road construction through contracts with private firms, in lieu of the use of force account, with the requirement that the successful bidder shall employ primarily Indians of the reservation on which the road is to be constructed.

The conferees are in agreement that the administrative expenses to be financed from

program funds shall not exceed \$1,375,000 for the headquarters and area offices, and \$1,930,000 for reservation management.

Amendment No. 8: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed 233 passenger vehicles for replacement only instead of 250 as proposed by the House and 216 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Corrects printing error.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes House provision, as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$27,124,000 for management and protection instead of \$27,068,000 as proposed by the House and \$27,375,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase over the House bill includes: a decrease of \$100,000 for new park areas now partially financed; a decrease of \$110,000 for pre-Mission 66 areas; a decrease of \$50,000 for the safety staff; and increases for the following: National Park Service training center requirements, \$25,000; for additional U.S. Park Police, \$80,000; employees' compensation fund payments, \$46,000; purchase of a search and rescue aircraft for Lake Mead Recreational Area, \$25,000; and 1964 Pay Act costs, \$140,000.

Amendment No. 13: Provides travel limitation of \$650,000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$21,566,750 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities instead of \$21,375,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,758,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$75,000 for roads and trails; \$100,000 for buildings, utilities, and other facilities; \$16,750 for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Amendment No. 15: Provides a travel limitation of \$187,500 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$180,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Provides limitation of \$5,300,000 on the funds available for acquisition of lands as proposed by the House instead of \$7,424,600 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided deletes the \$300,000 contained in the House bill for acquiring lands in Civil War areas and includes \$300,000 for acquiring lands in the Cape Cod National Seashore Area and \$200,000 for the acquisition of lands for the Bad Lands National Monument, S. Dak.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$32,697,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of \$36,895,200 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes \$2,379,000 for camping and picnicking facilities and \$4,023,000 for employee housing.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$29,000,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$30,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes \$2,020,000 for construction of the North Shore Road in the Lake Mead National Recreational Area.

Amendment No. 19: Provides a travel limitation of \$500,000 for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House and \$528,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$2,136,750 for general administrative expenses instead of \$2,120,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,153,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Amendment No. 21: Provides a travel limitation of \$103,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$108,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 22 and 23: Provide for the purchase of 120 passenger motor vehicles in-

stead of 114 as proposed by the House and 124 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides for the purchase of one aircraft as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Territories

The conferees are in agreement that the pay act absorption under administration of territories shall be allocated proportionately among the various offices, including the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and general administration.

Mineral resources

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$63,700,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$64,808,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided reflects the following changes in the amounts carried in the House bill: a decrease of \$355,000 for production of the National Atlas; a decrease of \$325,000 for marine geology and hydrology; an increase of \$350,000 for water resources investigations; an increase of \$100,000 for preliminary design of a Geological Survey building in Washington, D.C.; and an increase of \$230,000 for 1964 Pay Act costs. The conferees are in agreement that the construction funds for the Geological Survey building in Washington, D.C., shall be budgeted under the General Services Administration.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$29,404,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$29,054,000 as proposed by the House and \$29,926,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$250,000 for study of producing tars and oils from Utah and other western coals through carbonization and \$100,000 for a comprehensive study of new uses for asphalt.

Amendment No. 27: Provides a travel limitation of \$700,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the House instead of \$746,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$5,075,000 instead of \$3,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,575,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes \$1,000,000 for project gasoline; \$375,000 for planning and engineering a pilot plant in South Dakota for production of gas from lignite; and \$500,000 for the development of a pilot plant in connection with coal gasification projects. The projects shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dated June 10, 1963.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$615,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$610,000 as proposed by the House and \$621,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for 1964 Pay Act costs.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$17,832,900 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$17,175,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,682,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$136,800 for initiation of a north Pacific gear research and development program; \$87,600 for expansion of research on effects of pesticides; \$6,500 for payment to employee's compensation fund; \$50,000 for 1964 pay act costs; \$92,000 for technical assistance on commercial fisheries in the Big Bend and other reservoir areas in South Dakota; \$125,000 for biological studies of menhaden in the Gulf of Mexico; \$60,000 for research on means of controlling the red tide phenomenon; and

\$100,000 to promote the production of oysters by the propagation of disease-resistant strains.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$4,450,000 for construction instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,458,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for construction of a fishery research vessel for use in the North Pacific and Bering Sea.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$653,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$640,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for replacement of an obsolete accounting machine.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$30,589,900 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$29,879,400 as proposed by the House and \$31,685,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$120,500 for 1964 pay act costs; \$200,000 for the Southeastern cooperative wildlife disease study at the University of Georgia; \$55,000 for expansion of reservoir research program in the Missouri River Basin; \$100,000 for research on improved and selective bird damage control measures; \$45,000 for establishment of a sport fishery management project, eastern Tennessee; \$30,000 for establishment of a sport fishery management project, West Virginia; \$30,000 for a cooperative fishery unit at the University of Idaho; \$30,000 for a cooperative fishery unit at Pennsylvania State University; and \$100,000 for expanded research on methods of predator control. The amount provided for wildlife research includes provision for undertaking the program for propagation of endangered whooping cranes.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$5,243,500 for construction instead of \$3,678,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,898,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$80,000 for acquiring a surplus vessel for the Sandy Hook Marine Laboratory, N.J.; \$72,000 for additional facilities, Fish Control Laboratory, Warm Springs, Ga.; \$115,000 for surveys, plans, water supply, and building repair at the fish genetics facility, Beulah, Wyo.; \$133,000 for impoundment facilities, Ouray National Wildlife Refuge, Utah; and construction at the following National Fish Hatcheries: Warm Springs, Ga., \$116,500; Garrison Dam, N. Dak., \$90,000; White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., \$100,000; Hagerman, Idaho, \$105,000; Ennis, Mont., \$113,000; Greers Ferry, Ark., \$188,000; Lyman, Miss., \$104,000; Cheraw, S.C., \$159,000; and Mesquero Indian Reservation, N. Mex., \$190,000.

The conferees recommend that the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission give early consideration to initiating land acquisition to establish a National Wildlife Refuge in Pike County, Mo., in the vicinity of Ananda, Mo.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$1,359,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,325,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for automatic data processing of cost records and financial statements by commercial firms.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38: Provides for purchase of not to exceed 103 passenger motor vehicles instead of 98 as proposed by the House and 108 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$4,010,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$3,858,400 for salaries and expenses instead of

\$3,790,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,893,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes \$53,400 for two additional field committee chairmen and related expenses and \$15,000 for the Division of Information.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES Department of Agriculture Forest Service

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$147,312,000 for forest land management instead of \$143,609,000 as proposed by the House and \$150,147,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$200,000 for timber sales administration; \$1,000,000 for recreation-public use; \$250,000 for structural improvements for fire and general purposes; \$491,000 for employee compensation payments; \$1,000,000 for 1964 pay act costs; \$300,000 for fire suppression and prevention in southern California; and \$462,000 for land acquisition including \$200,000 for the Chattahoochee National Forest, Ga., and \$262,000 for the Ouachita National Forest, Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Amendment No. 42: Provides limitation of \$962,000 on land acquisition instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,162,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$25,893,000 for forest research instead of \$23,948,000 as proposed by the House and \$30,755,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$250,000 for additional forest insect, disease and utilization research, Athens, Ga.; \$75,000 for additional timber, watershed and wildlife research, Rapid City, S. Dak.; \$250,000 for additional marketing research, Princeton, W. Va.; \$275,000 for additional fire research, Riverside, Calif.; \$100,000 for additional genetics and insect research, Corvallis, Oreg.; \$25,000 for additional watershed, range, insect and disease research, Logan, Utah; \$50,000 for expansion of timber management research, Alexandria, La.; \$150,000 for expansion of research on restoration of strip-mined land in Appalachian region, Berea, Ky.; \$35,000 for research on southern pine beetle control, Gulfport, Miss.; \$100,000 for increased research and watershed management and timber production in Hawaii; \$450,000 to complete construction of the Forest Protection and Wood Utilization Laboratory at Alexandria, La.; and \$185,000 for preparation of designs and specifications for research facilities at the following locations: Morgantown, W. Va. (\$31,500); Ft. Collins, Colo. (\$79,000); Sewanee, Tenn. (\$18,500); Missoula, Mont. (\$28,000); and Houghton, Mich. (\$28,000).

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$63,200,000 for forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$66,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$250,000 for acquisition of lands for Wasatch National Forest as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 136 passenger motor vehicles instead of 126 as proposed by the House and 146 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$65,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$58,960,750 for Indian health activities instead of \$58,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$59,171,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill in-

cludes \$105,750 for 1964 Pay Act costs and \$105,000 for the training of Indian women as nurse assistants and practical nurses in facilities available to the Indian Health Service in South Dakota.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$5,350,000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,676,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$5,465,000 for remodeling of the Civil Service Commission building as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct that the General Services Administrator transfer the building to the Smithsonian Institution as soon as it is vacated by the Civil Service Commission in order that the remodeling can be initiated without delay.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$511,000 for initiating preparation of plans and specifications for the National Air Museum Building as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
BEN REIFEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference action provides a total of \$958,456,500 for fiscal year 1964 for the Department of the Interior—excluding the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies—and certain related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service and Indian health activities.

The conference total is a decrease of \$70,052,500, or 7 percent, from the budget estimate. The final bill is \$29,831,300 over the House bill and \$27,236,900 under the Senate bill.

The appropriations allowed for 1964 represent an increase of \$22,762,400, or 2 percent, over the 1963 appropriations. However, the effective increase is \$37,622,400 when the 1963 figures are adjusted on a comparable basis to deduct the forest fire deficiencies appropriated in the 1963 Supplemental Appropriation Act.

Although we have made a significant reduction in the budget request, I believe the bill makes adequate provision for the essential additional requirements that must be provided for if we are to preserve and develop our great natural resources. It should be noted that appropriations for most of the activities covered by the bill have more than tripled since 1955. For that year comparable appropriations totaled only about \$306 million as contrasted to the \$958.5 million carried in this bill. I am convinced that effective use of the funds being appropriated in this bill will provide for all essential requirements in fiscal year 1964.

EXPANSION OF RESEARCH

I would like to again emphasize the concern of our committee over the rapid expansion proposed in the budget for many of the research programs funded by appropriations in the bill. We have made reductions in these requests, including oceanography and water resources research, as we do not feel that every action possible is being taken to eliminate duplication among the many agencies involved and to discontinue projects of lower priority in order to

make personnel and resources available to undertake new research requirements. I hope there will be more progress in this regard during the current year and that it will be reflected in the budget requests for fiscal year 1965.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

In line with this, our committee will continue to be concerned over the increasing number of employees being requested by the agencies. It is essential that the number of Federal employees, with few exceptions, be held to the current level. We have disallowed a majority of the new positions requested in the 1964 budget and will expect that new or expanded essential activities will be implemented through securing maximum productivity from existing personnel and the shifting of individuals from work of lower priority to higher priority work. In line with this policy, the bill requires generally an absorption of over 20 percent of the additional pay act costs in fiscal year 1964. It is expected that this reduction will be allocated to old line projects and activities of a less urgent character, helping to offset additional manpower requirements in more essential areas.

LAND OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON

In disallowing the request of \$724,600 to acquire additional land on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Ver-

non the committee believes that the \$213,000 appropriated last year to acquire the Mockley Point site of 133 acres, the primary reason for the passage of the authorization by Congress, is all that is warranted in these times when every effort must be made to reduce Federal expenditures.

The committee again carefully reviewed this proposition and found no evidence that any action is planned in this area that would in any way detract from the present view from Mount Vernon. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission has formally advised the committee that the sewage treatment plant in question will be located outside the area covered by Public Law 87-362 and out of sight of Mount Vernon.

Considering that foundations currently own 350 acres of land opposite Mount Vernon, and have indicated their plans to donate these holdings to the Government; that 151 acres has already been donated; and that scenic easements are to be largely donated on about 2,600 acres, it does not appear that there is any real problem left in this area warranting further Federal expenditures.

It should be noted that Public Law 87-362 limited appropriations for acquiring the lands in question to \$937,600. This limitation was based on the estimate that 586 acres would be acquired at a cost of only \$1,600 per acre. It is evi-

dent from recent appraisals, averaging from \$3,000 to \$5,000 an acre, that a considerable increase in the authorization would be required if the Federal Government was to purchase the remaining acreage in question.

This area is presently under adequate planning and zoning controls by the Prince Georges County Commissioners, and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. This latter group has recently announced plans to acquire \$30 million worth of park land in this general area and the committee feels that any additional land acquisition that may be found desirable for park purposes should appropriately be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction which enjoys some of the highest per capita incomes in the country.

APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

Major items in the bill include \$270.9 million for the American Indian, including education, welfare, resource management, and health activities; \$254.4 million for the U.S. Forest Service; \$112.5 million for the National Park Service; \$109.8 million for mineral resources, including Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and the Office of Coal Research; and \$71.6 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I will insert at this point a summary tabulation of the amounts in the bill:

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Public land management.....	\$415,579,000	\$387,988,800	\$404,269,100	\$394,260,550	—\$21,318,450	+\$6,271,750	—\$10,008,550
Mineral resources.....	122,062,000	107,588,000	112,905,000	109,768,500	—12,293,500	+2,230,500	—3,136,500
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	74,666,000	65,933,400	74,172,400	71,564,300	—3,101,700	+5,630,990	—2,608,100
Office of Saline Water.....	12,350,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	11,850,000	—500,000		
Office of the Solicitor.....	4,083,000	4,000,000	4,010,000	4,000,000	—83,000		—10,000
Office of the Secretary.....	4,084,000	3,790,000	3,893,400	3,858,400	—225,600	+68,400	—35,000
Total, definite appropriations.....	632,824,000	581,100,200	611,099,900	595,301,750	—37,522,250	+14,201,550	—15,798,150
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts.....	10,845,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	10,760,000	—85,000		
Total, borrowing authorization.....	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	—7,000,000		
Total, annual contract authority.....	17,500,000				—17,500,000		
Total, title I, Department of the Interior.....	674,169,000	597,860,200	627,859,900	612,061,750	—62,107,250	+14,201,550	—15,798,150
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES							
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:							
Total, definite appropriations.....	257,817,000	244,520,000	264,495,000	253,598,000	—4,219,000	+9,078,000	—10,897,000
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total, Forest Service.....	258,587,000	245,290,000	265,265,000	254,368,000	—4,219,000	+9,078,000	—10,807,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	70,000	50,000	70,000	65,000	—5,000	+15,000	—5,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	91,000	91,000	91,000	91,000			
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Indian health activities.....	65,081,000	63,750,000	64,847,500	64,310,750	—770,250	+560,750	—536,750
Indian Claims Commission.....	313,000	297,000	297,000	297,000	—16,000		
National Capital Planning Commission.....	717,000	650,000	650,000	650,000	—67,000		
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	2,220,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	—1,200,000		
Smithsonian Institution.....	24,174,000	16,537,000	22,513,000	22,513,000	—1,661,000	+5,976,000	
Transitional grants to Alaska.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	107,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	—7,000		
Total, definite appropriations.....	353,570,000	329,995,000	357,063,500	345,624,750	—7,945,250	+15,629,750	—11,438,750
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000			
Total, title II, related agencies.....	354,340,000	330,765,000	357,833,500	346,394,750	—7,945,250	+15,629,750	—11,438,750
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION							
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Island Corporation.....	(186,000)	(186,000)	(186,000)	(186,000)			
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation.....							
Grand total:							
Definite appropriations.....	986,394,000	911,095,200	968,163,400	940,926,500	—45,467,500	+29,831,300	—27,236,900
Indefinite appropriations of receipts.....	11,615,000	11,530,000	11,530,000	11,530,000	—85,000		
Borrowing authorization.....	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	—7,000,000		
Annual contract authority.....	17,500,000				—17,500,000		
Total.....	1,028,509,000	928,625,200	985,693,400	958,456,500	—70,052,500	+29,831,300	—27,236,900

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that I will not offer the motion to recommit that I had announced here on the floor yesterday I planned to introduce. I do this for the reason that I recognize that savings have been made over the budget estimate. I realize that our House conferees have succeeded in reducing the Senate bill, and that these savings must be justified and accepted in the Senate. I realize also the problem, if the motion to recommit carried, of maintaining the savings that this conference report already represents.

I am still opposed and very firmly opposed to spending any of our money for an air museum. I shall certainly vote against any appropriation for that purpose whenever it comes before this body. But, in view of the savings that have been made by our conferees, I will not offer my motion at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman a question or two concerning the conference report? Do I understand now that this is approximately \$28 million or \$29 million above the figure that the House voted?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, it is \$29.8 million over the House bill and \$27.2 under the Senate bill. It is about a split.

Mr. GROSS. Then instead of any economy in this conference report there is provided millions of dollars of increased spending?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is about \$70 million, or 7 percent, below the budget.

Mr. GROSS. The budget figure was the bloated asking price. When are we going to have an appropriation bill that is cut below last year's spending? Let me ask the gentleman about the Civil Service Building. You have money in this bill for renovation of it. What is that building going to be used for now?

Mr. KIRWAN. That money is there to remodel the Civil Service Building which was formerly the old Patent Office Building. It is not to build a new building, but to remodel it. It is very much needed. It is one of the historic old buildings in the United States and it should be preserved.

Mr. GROSS. I asked the gentleman if he can tell me for what purpose the building is going to be used?

Mr. KIRWAN. It will be used to house the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts as authorized by the act of March 28, 1958.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, this is what I suspected: We are putting up brandnew buildings all over this Washington, D.C., to house the various agencies of the Federal Government and here we are going to renovate a Government-owned office building and put an art gallery in it or something of that kind.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is something that the gentleman has overlooked. There are some 7 million tourists coming to this city and they spend about \$1 million a day here. They spend about \$385 million a year and they are entitled to

have an adequate building to see the best art in the world. Smithsonian now has no space to exhibit these priceless works of art.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there is a National Gallery of Art, and a big one, right here near the Capitol.

Mr. KIRWAN. This building is to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution. This, you might say, is the anniversary of giving \$100 billion to the rest of the world and, surely, you would give \$5 million to 7 million Americans who are spending \$385 million a year here.

Mr. GROSS. I have not been voting to give billions of dollars to the rest of the world. I thought I had some assurance with reference to this building matter when the bill was up before.

Well that still does not entitle you to spend money to convert that building to a portrait gallery in view of the fact that the Government is spending millions upon millions of dollars for rental space in privately owned buildings in Washington in addition to the millions for new buildings. I thought I had assurance when this bill was on the floor of the House that this would not be done.

Mr. KIRWAN. This old building is no longer adequate for office space and that is why they are constructing a new building for the Civil Service Commission. The act of 1958 provided for preserving the old building and converting it into a museum. It will be much cheaper than building a new museum.

Mr. GROSS. This is the old Civil Service Building, do I understand?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, and it is going to be remodeled. This is to finance what the Congress authorized in 1958 as soon as the Civil Service Commission moved out of the building. They are scheduled to transfer to their new building this fall.

Mr. GROSS. I opposed it when the bill was being considered here on the floor of the House until I had the assurance that this would not be done.

Mr. KIRWAN. If you opposed it, that does not alter the fact that the Congress passed the act. This Government is operated by a majority.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, well, I know that. Can the gentleman tell me where the tourists are going to park their automobiles while they are they are visiting this portrait gallery?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know about the question of parking but I assume some provision will be made for it.

Mr. GROSS. Are the tourists going to park their automobiles on the roof? That building is in the heart of the city. There is no parking space in that area.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the chairman of the committee in saying that I believe the conference committee did a very good job in this particular instance. I realize that we could not satisfy everyone and satisfy the ideas of everyone as to what should be done or what should be increased or decreased. But I think we

made a very good decision with the Senate.

It is my opinion that the final result is a good one. It is 7 percent below the budget request. I think that the conference report represents a fine solution, and I do hope that the House will approve the conference report as submitted.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. As I interpret the conference committee report, there is not only an increase in the amount of about \$30 million over what the House approved, but in addition the conference committee did restore an appropriation for extensive plans with regard to a National Air Museum which when completed will contemplate an additional appropriation for that structure of about \$40 million. Therefore, by restoring that authorization or that appropriation we have to anticipate that there will be an additional \$40 million to be appropriated which was not contemplated by the House at the time this appropriation bill was passed by the House.

I would like to ask this further question in addition to having made that observation. That question is this: We are not anticipating any additional revenue for the Federal Government; in fact, we are anticipating a reduced tax intake and possibly reduced revenue. How does this appropriation bill now stack up with the 1963 appropriation, which I feel should be a guiding influence insofar as the present appropriations of this Congress are concerned? Can the gentleman inform me how much above the 1963 appropriation bill these appropriations are?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. Over the 1963 appropriations it is only 2 percent, and it is estimated the Federal revenue from this bill will be \$787 million in 1964, an increase of \$7 million over 1963. In answer to the first part of the gentleman's question we do not have a cost estimate on the building. That is why we should provide these planning funds to find out what an adequate building will cost. It will take 2 years to complete the planning and then the agency will have to report back to Congress and obtain an authorization for construction. There can be no appropriation for construction until Congress has had an opportunity to review the plans and the cost and authorize construction.

Mr. McCLORY. Nevertheless, by committing the Congress today to the appropriation of \$511,000 for initiating plans and specifications for a National Air Museum Building, we are, in effect, obligating a future Congress to the extent of many millions of dollars.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the managers on the part of the House are to be congratulated for their work in connection with the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964.

I have been particularly interested in the plan to remodel the historic Patent Office Building, and have sponsored legislation to protect the National Collection of Fine Arts. I have been happy to work with a number of my colleagues in this connection, particularly the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], and, of course, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The Patent Office Building was designed by Robert Mills, the famous American architect who designed the Washington Monument and the U.S. Treasury Building, in the Nation's Capital.

It is the intention of the Congress for both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts to share occupancy of the building.

The Patent Office Building will make a fitting home for American art in years to come, and will be able to continue its service to our people.

The Congress directed the Smithsonian Institution, in 1846, to form a gallery of art for the Nation. In 1849 the Smithsonian Institution began the collection of paintings and sculpture, and art objects in general.

The Smithsonian Institution, because of its congressional sponsorship, has, through the National Collection of Fine Arts, been the keystone of the Federal outlook and concern for the arts. Through the expansion and development of the National Collection of Fine Arts the national concern for the arts will have its greatest flowering in the years ahead.

In 1930 the Smithsonian Institution struggled and failed to get funds to house its collections, and so it was not until the 75th Congress that steps were taken to provide a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts.

The 75th Congress not only demonstrated its intention to provide a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts but it also made it possible for private funds to be accepted for the purchase of works of art by living artists, and made possible the right to raise such funds for financing exhibitions of current and past works of art from the great store of such work in the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Today the National Collection works with the U.S. Information Agency in sending exhibits of American art overseas.

I have sponsored legislation, House Joint Resolution 241, with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], to carry such exhibits to the smaller cities and towns of our country, and I hope that this legislation will be favorably considered, for it is an important step forward.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the action of the other body in setting out on page 10 of their bill that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards to those tribes through the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purpose for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to both the Senate and the House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes have either been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution within 60 days from the date the report is submitted.

This provision is far better than the provision that was contained in the House bill which simply required the Department to submit to the committees a report on how the funds were to be used, which report should lay on the desk of the committees for 60 days, but which House provision did not require a resolution by the committees of both bodies, either approving or disapproving the plan for the disposition of these tribal funds.

I think it should be pointed out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has completely abdicated its rights and duties with respect to these tribal funds which are derived from judgments obtained by the various tribes by simply permitting the Department to handle these funds in almost any manner they propose. The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, that in every instance which has been called to my attention, the Department provides that the funds shall be used for the purchase of land to be taken by the Government and held in trust for the Indians to further perpetuate the Department of Interior and the Indian department for the next 50 years or more.

Tribes that are almost completely integrated, whose members are as competent as those employed by the Department of Interior, have been induced to set up land purchase programs to buy reservation areas for their people in an attempt to segregate the Indian and put him back under the regulation and control of the Indian department.

The Indian department is a very busy department of Government. Every year they come in for increased appropriations to hire more people to supervise less Indians, to handle less land, and to promulgate their own personal interests on down through the ages.

Congress has no business in turning these funds over to the Indian department to spend as they see fit to promote and promulgate their bureaucracy ad infinitum.

When an Indian tribe receives a judgment from the Court of Claims or from the Indian Claims Commission the disposition of those funds should be provided for by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate and by the Congress itself and not by the Indian Bureau. The pro-

vision in the Senate Appropriations Committee is actually too lenient and gives too much authority to the Bureau, but it is much better than simply having the Bureau report to the committees because it requires affirmative action on the part of the committees in either approving or disapproving the program.

I want to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee for making this provision possible, and I hope neither committee will take action until they have thoroughly studied a complete plan for the disposition of these funds.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HALL. I am in this form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALL moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, F.R. 5279, to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on their disagreement to Senate amendment 52 which appropriates funds for initiating preparation of plans and specifications for the National Air Museum Building.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 144, nays 245, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—144

Abbott	Erotzman	Fino
Abele	Brown, Ohio	Foreman
Adair	Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain
Alger	Bruce	Frelinghuysen
Anderson	Burton	Gary
Ashbrook	Cahill	Gathings
Ashmore	Chamberlain	Gibbons
Auchincloss	Clancy	Goodell
Ayres	Clausen,	Goodling
Baker	Don H.	Griffin
Baldwin	Cleveland	Gross
Barry	Collier	Grover
Battin	Colmer	Gubser
Becker	Cramer	Gurney
Beeremann	Cunningham	Hall
Belcher	Curtin	Halpern
Bell	Curtis	Hardy
Bennett, Mich.	Dague	Harvey, Ind.
Berry	Derounian	Harvey, Mich.
Betts	Derwinski	Hoeven
Bolton	Devine	Horton
Frances P.	Dole	Hosmer
Bolton	Dorn	Hutchinson
Oliver P.	Dowdy	Johansen
Bray	Dwyer	Jonas
Brock	Findley	Kastenmeier

King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McClary
McDade
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Meador
Milliken
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Norblad

O'Konski
Pelly
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schweiker
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stafford

Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—245

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boland
Boiling
Bow
Brademas
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Elliot
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gavin
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths

Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hawkins
Healy
Hechler
Hemphill
Boggs
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Huddlestone
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
MacDonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.

Osmer
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Price
Purcell
Quile
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Sennar
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staeble
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Westland
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy
Barrett
Bonner
Buckley
Celler
Clawson, Del.
Davis, Tenn.
Donohue
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Forrester
Garmatz
Giaino
Grabowski
Gray

Hagan, Ga.
Hebert
Hoffman
Holifield
Kilburn
Landrum
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McCulloch
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill

Philbin
Powell
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Stephens
Thompson, La.
Trimble
Wickersham
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Edmondson.

Mr. Giaino with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. HAWKINS and Mr. HERLONG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. HALPERN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 50, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—333

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres

Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.

Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.

Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler

Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meador
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion

Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Sennar
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staeble
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Westland
White
Whitten
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—50

Beermann
Berry
Betts
Bolton,
Frances P.

Bray
Bruce
Clancy
Curtin
Curtis

Derounian	Hoeven	Robison
Derwinski	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Devine	Johansen	Saylor
Dole	Kastenmeier	Schadeberg
Findley	King, N.Y.	Schweiker
Foreman	Laird	Skubitz
Goodell	Latta	Smith, Va.
Goodling	McClary	Snyder
Gross	McLoskey	Stinson
Gurney	MacGregor	Taft
Hall	O'Konski	Tuck
Harvey, Ind.	Poff	Wharton

NOT VOTING—50

Abernethy	Hanna	Powell
Barrett	Hansen	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Hébert	Roosevelt
Bonner	Hoffman	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Hollifield	Scott
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Shelley
Clawson, Del.	Kilburn	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Sickles
Dingell	Lesinski	Stephens
Donohue	Long, La.	Sullivan
Edmondson	McCulloch	Thompson, La.
Forrester	Martin, Mass.	Trimble
Garmatz	Miller, N.Y.	Tupper
Gialmo	Monagan	Utt
Grabowski	Morrison	Wickersham
Gray	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Hagan, Ga.	Philbin	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Gray with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brademas.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 7, line 4, after the word "Colorado", insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$450,000 shall be for assistance to the Newtown, North Dakota, Public School District Numbered 1, for construction of an addition to the Newtown Public School."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 7, line 7, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$370,000 shall be for assistance to the Grants, New Mexico, Municipal School District Numbered 3, Valencia County, New Mexico, for construction of an addition to the public high school serving the Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma".

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 9, line 20, insert the following: "except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to take a couple of minutes in which to say that I think this is one of the best bills that has been considered by this Congress, and to say that for the past 20 years I have been listening to MIKE KIRWAN talk about this bill as being an all-American bill, that this bill is for America and for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anyone in the Congress who has done more to develop the natural resources of our country, to open up the national parks to all Americans, than has MIKE KIRWAN.

In political parlance we have back home, "Mr. Democrat" or "Mr. Republican." In the Halls of Congress, we have the same thing. On yesterday we had Mr. CARL VINSON as one of the great men in this Congress who has done so much for this country. MIKE KIRWAN knows as much about the Department of the Interior as CARL VINSON does about the U.S. Navy. I would like to suggest today, because of the tremendous time and effort that MIKE KIRWAN has put into the operations of the Department of the Interior over the years, all for Americans and all for America, that he be our "Mr. American" in the House of Representatives.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us remember over the years Mr. KIRWAN's charge to the House that we were neglecting the original American in this country, the Indian. I do not think anyone in this House or in the other body has done so much for the real Americans, the Indian population, as has MIKE KIRWAN. Just in the last 5 years he has provided over a billion dollars in the Interior bill to provide urgently needed educational, welfare, and health services to the Indians, including new schools, hospitals, and roads. He has taken especial interest in promoting their economic development so that they may become self-sufficient.

I do not think any of us will forget the fight he made to stop mineral stockpiling and subsidies 4 or 5 years ago. Almost alone, he and his committee took on everyone and everything and cut off appropriations for the stockpiling program under Public Law 733, saving \$70 million and defeated the new minerals subsidy bill which would have authorized new appropriations up to \$650 million.

During the 18 years that MIKE KIRWAN has been chairman of the Interior Subcommittee over \$6 billion has been appropriated for the activities of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies. Just think where our Nation would be today but for the foresightedness of MIKE KIRWAN and others to provide for the development and preservation of our great natural resources including our forests, fish and wildlife, minerals, water, and the vast public lands.

A typical example that comes to mind is the action he took to improve conditions in our national parks. It was during one of his extensive field trips in 1955 to review activities in the field that he realized the deplorable conditions existing in the national parks. Construction of facilities had not kept pace with the great increase in the number of visitors. When he discovered that the budget request for construction for fiscal year 1956 was only for \$5,200,000, he took immediate steps to have the construction appropriation increased to \$15 million to provide immediately for expanded facilities, including picnic areas, comfort stations, visitors centers, etc. This was a whole year in advance of the time that the administration planned to begin its Mission 66 program.

We are also well aware of his ceaseless efforts over the years to provide adequate appropriations for reclamation, flood control, and navigation in the public works appropriation bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to MIKE KIRWAN today as "Mr. All American," because certainly he deserves that connotation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on our distinguished colleague, Mr. KIRWAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I must join my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in the eulogy of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

It has been my pleasure to have served with Mr. KIRWAN for many years. Whenever he comes to the floor he always has my undivided attention—as he also has the attention of all Members of the House. It has been my privilege to observe—when you come to analyze his position—he is invariably for the average man—the man of the street and the field and the shop—the man who has daily financial problems, the family that sometimes is uncertain whether there will be breakfast on the table in the morning, or whether there will be sufficient money to buy shoes for the children. On one hand he is the idealist, the philanthropist, the humanitarian. And on the other hand he is the practical politician who knows how to implement his love of mankind in the drafting and management of his bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must concur unqualifiedly in the gracious tribute of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He is a benefactor and a credit to his State and to the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the very kind remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON], and I want to thank them both. I am reminded of something Speaker Clark, of Missouri, in his book on his political career, quoted from a speech of a prominent man of an earlier day:

The sweetest incense ever to greet the nostrils of a public man is the applause of the people.

THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune to be in conference on the other side of the Capitol yesterday and so missed the opportunity to join in the recognition paid our beloved and distinguished colleague from Georgia, CARL VINSON, and his remarkable record in becoming the all-time dean of the American Congress.

Mr. VINSON has served longer than any other man in the 88 Congresses, longer than all the thousands of able and patriotic men who have been Members of the Congress, both in the House and the Senate. It is hardly to be expected that another such record will be established in the next 200 years.

It is not only remarkable for its length of tenure but also because it has been a continuous service.

The man who for many years held this record was Speaker Cannon of Illinois. Speaker Cannon for many years enjoyed the distinction of being the oldest Member of the House and the man with the longest continuous service. But,

as he himself expressed it on one occasion, there were 2 years in which he took a vacation "at the suggestion of his constituency."

The gentleman from Georgia has not only been here longer but he has served consecutively and continuously for what amounts—and what will eventually constitute a full half-century—with the possible exception of the service of Gladstone in the British House of Commons—the longest continuous service in the history of world parliaments.

But the supreme distinction of the tenure of CARL VINSON in the House and the Congress lies not in length of service but in the quality of that service.

After all, the principal consideration is not how long he has served here but how well he has served here.

"Better 50 years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay." Therein lies the greatness of the man and the measure of his contribution to national welfare in the most critical years of the Republic.

Few Presidents of the United States have made in their 4 or 8 years of limited service as significant a contribution to the safety and security of the country and its international prestige as CARL VINSON in his half century on the quarterdeck of the ship of state.

I recall distinctly, and sometimes with no little feeling of trepidation, the situation which obtained at the close of the Second World War. We had thoroughly sold the country on the idea that this was a war to end all wars, and when victory was achieved, there was a stampede. And this Congress was largely responsible for it. We cannot be taken to task too harshly under the circumstances. Every wife, mother, and sister was importuning by telephone, telegram, and letter demanding that we "send their boy back home." American womanhood had gone through a war period of agonized anxiety and when the news of the armistice came they expected to see him come marching back with banners waving early the next morning. Tear-stained letters cried:

The war is over. The war to end all wars has been won. We want our man back home. What's the use of keeping him over there? There will never be another war as long as time stands. We want him back now.

Under that tremendous pressure from every section of every congressional district in the Nation, Congress, almost overnight, severed all red tape, abandoned all precautions, and brought our vast armies back on record time. We practically abandoned national defense.

Over there, men dropped their guns where they stood and ran for the ship. We left billions of dollars worth of invaluable war materiel and weapons. The latest engines of war were left to rust in the jungles while other nations carefully conserved all implements and every lesson to be salvaged from the greatest of all world conflicts.

Our entire system of defense was disorganized, disintegrated, and dissipated. When we belatedly woke to the menace massing against us on the world frontier—shocked and bewildered to find the Nation in mortal danger—we lacked everything essential to survival. At this

crisis CARL VINSON rose to the occasion. He had to start from a new base of operation. It was necessary to work from the ground up and in the tragically short time available build what amounted to a new system of defense.

Many wars have been won or lost through the invention or adaptation of some particularly effective weapon. Herein lay the burden of his task. Today every weapon of the last war is as obsolete and outmoded as the French '75's.

It is the duty of Congress—and therefore of the Committee on Armed Services to provide these weapons. We were all but hopelessly handicapped by incredible delay and inertia. In the renaissance of the last few crowded years no one or no one agency has had a larger part or a more critical responsibility than CARL VINSON and the Committee on Armed Services. Against heavy handicaps they have rehabilitated our defense.

This notable occasion in which an honored public servant of the people has established a record of 50 years devoted capacity and loyalty affords us an opportunity to lay our flowers and encomiums where they are most appropriate, and most deserved.

Modern warfare with its terrible forces of destruction and devastation is not merely a matter of victory or defeat. It is a question of survival. It threatens extinction—not only of the American Nation, but the extinction of Christian civilization throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is our earnest hope that CARL VINSON may serve another 50 years and continue to render the Nation the same distinguished service he has rendered the last 50 years.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio. The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

VETERINARY MEDICINE WEEK

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 513) authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proc-

lamation designating the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, in recognition of the contributions which the veterinarians of this Nation have made through the eradication of diseases, the maintenance of high standards for food inspection, and research in various fields of veterinary medicine, and for services they have rendered to all lovers of pets.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 401 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for two years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, for the legislative history, I would like to call the attention of the House to an apparent mistake in the committee report. On page 1 of the committee report, under the paragraph headed "Purpose" the next to the last sentence reads:

The present law will expire after the 1961 crop of peanuts. This bill will extend the definition through the 1962 and 1963 crops.

I am advised that this is a mistake and that it should read:

The present law will expire with the 1963 crop and this bill would extend it to the 1964 and 1965 crop.

This is academic, but I thought the record should be clear.

During the hearings on this bill there was no opposition, and I think it is quite understandable that there would be no opposition. If this commodity is not in surplus certainly it should not be under acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

I did note, however, that two of the minority members of the subcommittee signed minority views, and perhaps their position will be further enunciated in general debate.

The consideration of this bill today, Mr. Speaker, does bring into perspective several administration policies to which there is a great deal of opposition. Maybe this is not the proper forum for administration policies to be debated as we are the legislative branch of the Government and should assume our responsibility independent of administration influence. However, politics playing the role that it does in our system, it appears that our entire legislative role is regulated by administration positions and so therefore these same administration positions conveniently lend themselves to analysis and review in this legislative body.

What are the administration policies that are placed into perspective this afternoon? Certainly the one of greatest concern to me, and I think to people generally, is the lack of action by this House and the other body as well. This deadlock has come about by the administration's insistence on unacceptable legislative proposals. Presumably this statement would cause someone to arise and to observe that if the Rules Committee would only grant a rule on certain administration measures pending before that committee, Congress could proceed with the work. It is not my impression that there is any great urgency on the part of the leadership to bring certain administration bills to a vote in the Rules Committee and to the floor for debate. We have such well-known measures pending as the mass transit bill, the Youth Conservation Corps, and several other measures that generally have as their objective expanding the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and placing further burden on the Treasury.

For my part, I think it might be well for the administration to force a vote in the Rules Committee which it can do under the packed arrangement, and bring these bills to the floor for a decision. It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the reluctance of this House to favorably consider these administration measures is a true reflection of the thinking of the citizens generally. Said another way, I do not believe that such proposals that will further project the influence of the Federal Government are in harmony with the mood of the electorate.

Therefore, I cannot understand why this House cannot dispose of these issues, complete its work and adjourn. Last week the biggest decision the House had to make was whether or not the Secretary of Commerce should prescribe the characteristics of seat belts, if such seat belts were to be sold in interstate commerce. And this week, it appears the most momentous decision will be whether or not approximately 1,500 farmers should be permitted to raise boiling peanuts without being subjected to acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

To those of us representing the Middle West, it is hard to understand why the Secretary of Agriculture schedules a trip to Russia just at the time farmers are making plans and preparations for their 1964 wheat crop. And again, someone may want to reply the farmers have by referendum already selected their wheat

program for 1964 and therefore no further consideration of the problem is necessary. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a rather irresponsible attitude. The choice that was given the farmer was really not a fair one and not one that came about by the usual legislative process.

May I remind the Members of the House that this same Kennedy program was rejected by the House on June 21, 1962. The House then passed a simple extension of the 1962 program that was generally acceptable to most of us in the Middle West. But when the bill went to the other body, they defied the will of the House and again inserted the so-called Freeman bushel management program. In conference the House conferees acquiesced as was expected, but even more than that, provision was made for certain compensatory payments that were not a part of either the House or the Senate bills. Then when the conference report came before the House, it is my contention that it was again rejected. The record will show that it passed by a vote of 202 to 197, but this vote was only possible after three Members of the majority had been persuaded by the leadership to change their votes from "nay" to "yea"—Rutherford, Magnuson, and Carey. This clearly indicates that again this so-called bushel management two-price system did not represent the thinking of the House, and therefore it should have come as no surprise that this concept was rejected by referendum by the Nation's wheat farmers.

Although it is not possible for me to determine what, if any, action the majority intends to take in regard to wheat legislation this year, there was a story in the Wall Street Journal this morning by a reliable reporter that certain conclusions were developing as to what should be provided for the 1965 crop, but the inference is a clear one that no action is anticipated for the crop next year. My correspondence and conversations do not reflect alarm on the part of the Kansas wheat farmers. My personal conversations have convinced me, however, that the rejection of the Freeman plan was not so much a rejection of the program itself as it was a rejection of the concept of Government management of privately owned farms.

It seems to me that there is an area of agreement that has commenced to evolve. This agreement appears to be discernible to some extent among the farmer organizations, between farmers themselves, and the story just referred to would indicate that even within the Department of Agriculture there has been a recognition of these areas of agreement. The Department, the story indicates, has finally concluded that a voluntary program will accomplish virtually as much control as a mandatory program and the cost could even be less. This is not to imply that there would be unlimited production, but it does suggest that compliance can be attained by incentives, and the result of the two different approaches would be comparable. I hope this story is well founded, as I think it represents a lot of fresh and

realistic thinking in the Department of Agriculture.

I would also like to observe, Mr. Speaker, that this concept is very nearly like the one that was employed by approximately 20 Members from the Middle West in developing legislation for a wheat program, not for 1965 but for 1964. Would it be too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture return home and translate this new philosophy into legislation and submit it to the Congress? If our legislative schedule for the next few weeks is to be dominated by bills of comparable significance to the one we have today, the seat belt bill from last week, and the schedule that I anticipate for next week, certainly it would seem that any responsible leadership would want to utilize such time and effort as would be available to developing acceptable wheat legislation for 1964.

Although my view is obviously parochial because of the nature of the economy in my State of Kansas, this same dilemma apparently faces not only the cotton farmers but all of the industrial complexes with that commodity. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would employ your influence and prestige not only to expedite the work of this Congress but to improve the record of this Congress by favorably considering legislation needed for the Nation's agriculture.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has very clearly pointed out the legislative schedule, or the lack thereof, pointing out that last week our major legislation had to do with setting standards for seat belts on Federal automobiles and that today the major legislation, in fact, the first legislation before the House since the Easter recess relates to boiling peanuts, and since that is an important matter facing the Congress and the Nation today, it seems to me that all Members should be present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Abernethy	Glaimo	Lesinski
Barrett	Grabowski	Long, La.
Bonner	Hagan, Ga.	Maillard
Buckley	Harsha	Martin, Mass.
Cameron	Hébert	Meador
Clawson, Del.	Hechler	Miller, N.Y.
Davis, Tenn.	Hemphill	Monagan
Diggs	Hoffman	Morrison
Donohue	Hollfield	Morse
Edmondson	Kee	Norblad
Evins	Kilburn	O'Brien, Ill.
Fisher	King, Calif.	Philbin
Foreman	Knox	Powell
Forrester	Landrum	Roosevelt

Rostenkowski	Smith, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Scott	Springer	Thompson, N.J.
Shelley	Steed	Trimble
Sheppard	Stephens	Wickersham

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PEANUTS FOR BOILING

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the previous speaker, the gentleman from Kansas, complain of the insignificant nature of the bill under consideration because the gentleman is a member of the Rules Committee, which has consistently bottled up really important bills.

Mr. Speaker, it would be temptingly easy to be facetious about the pending bill concerning boiled peanuts. I, for one, shall not indulge in such ridicule because I am sure that the bill means much to the welfare of the districts of a few of my colleagues.

However, I do want to state that many of us in the House are eagerly awaiting the opportunity to vote on matters of more general interest and more urgent need.

We are fiddling in Congress while issues burn. I earnestly hope that we will soon get down to business, lest the symbol of the 88th Congress be one lonely, solitary boiled peanut.

Let us have done with peanut issues and try to tackle some giant ones.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 101, with Mr. FLYNT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that it had not been my desire at all in the consideration of this legislation to have the attention of the House for such a long period of time. I am very grateful for the tremendous interest that so many

wonderful ladies and gentlemen are expressing in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in 1957 this legislation was passed on the Consent Calendar. Two years later it was passed a second time on the Consent Calendar. After another 2 years, it was passed again on the Consent Calendar. This year this particular legislation was reported unanimously by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] and in the full committee, as I recall, only three votes were cast against it. The statement was made by one of our colleagues on the full committee that he did not think we should pass the bill on the Consent Calendar. I was delighted to follow the suggestion that he made and so, of course, we made no effort to pass the bill on the Consent Calendar.

Then, on May 6 we brought this bill up under suspension of the rules. May I say it seemed for some unforeseen reason that there might be a little opposition and when it seemed that some of our colleagues thought maybe we ought to get a rule, I very gladly agreed to vacate the order by which we were discussing this bill under suspension, and then we went to the Committee on Rules and obtained a rule. Here we are today to ask for a simple extension of 2 years of a bill which would permit farmers to plant peanuts for boiling purposes without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this issue. I should like to refresh the memory of those who are here this afternoon by saying the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and I were co-introducers of this legislation a number of years ago and in succeeding Congresses we passed this legislation on the Consent Calendar.

I would be delighted to answer any questions that any of you may have. We have at the present time only about 3,000 acres of these peanuts that are planted for boiling purposes. We find that there is no competition with other types of peanuts. There are 1,560,000 acres of peanuts that are planted under the acreage allotment provisions, but these 3,000 acres are planted by boys in school and by small farmers and are sold as a vegetable at football games and baseball games and so on.

They are sold green on the market, in the chainstores, and there are two or three small industrial plants that have been developed as a result of canning these peanuts to sell in the grocery stores.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. The last time our distinguished friend had this bill on the floor of the House he had some free samples. Did the gentleman bring any free samples today?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sir, if one of the pages will get my black briefcase, I have them here. The reason I did not offer these samples is because some of my

friends said after tasting them that they did not like them.

I am going to ask one of the pages if he will, please, to distribute these peanuts. I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, we can pass this legislation because I am about out of free sample peanuts.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a can. They are already open this time. The last time you had to get a can opener.

Mr. GROSS. If my friend will yield further—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir, but just 1 minute, if you will let me get these ready for distribution in the cloakroom.

Mr. GROSS. I would suggest that they be eaten over there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it proper, sir, to suggest that the Members go in the cloakroom and sample them?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida will proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleagues if you will go in the cloakrooms we will be delighted to furnish you these samples.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to answer any other questions. However, I want to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] who comes from the great Suwannee River section of our State, and who is very familiar with this succulent article about which I am talking.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman, my colleague from Florida, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I likewise introduced a companion bill to this bill, H.R. 101, which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS]. But I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. MATTHEWS. I come from an area of Florida where many of our small farmers are engaged in the peanut business. I know of no program in any other section of the country where they boil peanuts or where they have peanut boilers.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a need, and there certainly is, we want to help the little people in their efforts to try to grow a few acres of peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] has expired.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. These people grow a few acres of peanuts. Sometimes it is less than a half acre or a quarter of an acre, or just a small patch in their gardens. This is a method by which they can supplement their income. I know many people who make their living from selling roasted and boiled peanuts.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of people who are trying to help themselves and who are not on the relief rolls, as we have in other areas. These people are trying to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask the House to favorably act on this bill today.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] that I want to stipulate that these peanuts are not Yankee approved. In fact, the pigeons on Capitol Hill would not eat them. I threw some of them out to the pigeons and they would not eat them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The only consolations I can get from the gentleman is to say that since there will be no competition with the wonderful vegetables which come from the State of California, I know the gentleman will support my bill.

Mr. Chairman, the taste of a boiled peanut is unique. If the peanut were air conditioned, it would taste like an artichoke. It tastes like a dehumidified artichoke.

Mr. Chairman, during the depression days many of us remember having eaten swamp cabbage. I do not know whether the Members of the Committee are familiar with these huge palm trees, but when you cut them down you take out the heart of the palm tree, that is the cabbage. If a boiled peanut were dehumidified, you would have that swamp cabbage taste, a crunchy, delightful taste.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in my district you can get this delightful swamp cabbage. And, if you go there you can get them at the Sea Island Hotel in Cedar Key, Fla. If you spend some money there, tell them that Congressman BILLY MATTHEWS sent you.

Mr. Chairman, if my friends on the other side will agree, I am willing to go ahead and pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Is this a sort of supply management program?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not believe it would be any type of supply management program, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. What it is is an attempt to avoid the supply management program and the controls that other peanut farmers have?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You may say yes, but, of course, there are many, many crops that do not have supply management control. The gentleman and I are agreed that many of these crops do not need a supply management control. I do not think anybody has suggested this type of boiled peanut is anything but a kind of an agricultural commodity that does not need supply management.

Mr. DOLE. I want to point out it is a very serious question from this standpoint: We talk about supply management and many people have supply management control for their commodities and this is an effort to avoid it by this peanut bill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is the gentleman going to oppose this bill?

Mr. DOLE. I would try to make it applicable to all peanuts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the gentleman think it is a good bill?

Mr. DOLE. I think it would probably be better if no peanuts were exempt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I hope the gentleman will not put my people on the dole by opposing this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida who is a cosponsor of this legislation, my friend, Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. CRAMER. It may be of interest to the House to learn what was the genesis of this bill. At the outset, back in 1957, a number of farmers in my then district, now represented by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. GIBBONS, of Hillsboro, Fla., came to me with a complaint about the fact they had penalties assessed against them. They had very small acreage at that time. It was 15.6 acres in these green peanuts to be used for boiled peanut purposes. We thought that was wrong. I am one who does not agree with the general program on peanuts and other Government-controlled programs. I was delighted to introduce the bill after discussions with the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was in the area at that time. He discussed this with the farmers and he felt this penalty, and it was a penalty, was not justified but they had no choice but to impose the penalty. There were substantial differences involved. In view of the present law, the Department of Agriculture, myself, and others drafted the bill now before us back in 1957, which was enacted then and has been twice since that time. The purpose was to prevent these unfair penalties being assessed against small farmers growing peanuts to be boiled.

We have heard a lot about civil rights in this session of the Congress. If you want to do something for the Negro down South, you will let him continue to grow these peanuts for boiling purposes. They consume about 95 percent of these peanuts. It is part of their staple foodstuffs. The farmers cannot grow them without this provision in the law excluding boiled peanuts and green peanuts from allotment of acreage.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Are we to understand this simply extends the present law 2 additional years?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ABBITT. It is my understanding this legislation is not going to be made permanent?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 101 is about peanuts and in some ways, using the vernacular, it is peanuts. Involved are only 3,000 acres, only a tiny fraction of peanut land. The 3,000 acres also include, believe it or not, about 1,500 farmers. So, indeed, this involves presently few farmers. If it is regarded as

a civil rights bill—a thought that had not occurred to me—then my effort to amend this bill would broaden the civil rights aspect of it to all peanut farmers—not just the 1,500 presently involved.

This bill is not a joke and it is not a circus we are involved in here. The bill involves a very serious principle, and we invite your attention to that principle.

Simply stated, it is this: Is it fair to force taxpayers to pick up the tab caused by special interest loopholes in Government-control programs? That is the issue in this bill.

We may properly consider the plight of the little peanut farmer, but I think we also ought to give some consideration to the plight of the poor, struggling little taxpayer.

CCC losses under the peanut program in the last 2 years have averaged over \$25 million each year. That amount is not peanuts, even at the Federal level.

On May 31, 1963, which is the latest Department of Agriculture report, the taxpayers had \$17,057,940 tied up in peanuts. It was tied up as follows: In inventory, in Commodity Credit storage stock, \$15,530,207. Under CCC loan \$1,527,733 additional, for a total of \$17,057,940.

Those of you who are concerned about the cost of government should note the fact that the latest Department of Agriculture report predicted a "moderate surplus" in 1963.

So despite the fact that we are losing over \$25 million a year on the peanut program, and despite the fact that we have now tied up over \$17 million of our taxpayers' money in peanut stocks, taxpayers may reasonably expect to have to shell out still more dollars to make the Government stockpile of peanuts even higher.

If this bill is defeated, all peanuts for boiling, just like the peanuts processed for other purposes—and when they are planted there is no difference between peanuts for boiling and otherwise—all peanuts for boiling will have to come from Government-controlled acres. This, of course, would reduce the total production of peanuts in this country and would make supply management—Government control—more effective.

Of course, therefore, it would tend to reduce the buildup of peanut stocks. Every peanut produced on special-exemption acres, such as that proposed in this bill, adds to the surplus buildup and to load on the poor struggling taxpayer. Supply management is inefficient and terribly costly under the most ideal circumstances. Every loophole created in supply management, like the loophole proposed here, makes it more inefficient and most costly.

Cotton is in trouble today basically because controls have not really meant controls. We have kicked loophole after loophole into the cotton control program. Congress never really has had the guts to enforce controls.

Why? Our farmers are not willing to accept a police state in agriculture. The only way controls really will work is to go to the police state. In the absence of a police state the farmers are outwitting the bureaucrats and will outmaneuver them every time.

The uproar that followed the proposed jail sentences for dairy farmers shows neither the farmers nor Congress will accept a police state. This bill actually illustrates the breakdown of supply management and the high-price-support theory.

It has a basic pragmatic weakness. We want controls, but we do not really want them. We set up a control program then start creating loopholes in it.

Every Member who represents taxpayers, and I doubt if there are any exceptions, should vote "No" on this bill, to help the taxpayers, or aid me and my colleagues in my effort to amend this bill in order to extend the blessings of freedom and the opportunities of the marketplace to all peanut growers, not just the small circle who produce peanuts for boiling.

Let us either close the loopholes or pitch the whole expensive program.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman has just said that we should close the loopholes that now exist in this legislation. The gentleman lives in a corn producing area of the country. I wonder if he would be just as willing to close the loopholes which exist in the area of sweet corn from being carried as corn under controls.

Mr. FINDLEY. Corn is not produced under mandatory controls. There is no parallel between the present Government program for corn and the mandatory acreage control program for peanuts. I see no parallel. And I might say to the gentleman that I am just as willing to extend the exemption from Government control to all farmers, all producers of all commodities.

Mr. WAGGONER. I think what the gentleman fails to see is the fact that sweet corn is close to his heart, peanuts are close to somebody else's heart and he is not quite willing to give the same consideration to somebody else.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's memory may be faulty, because he should recall that on many occasions on this floor I have consistently opposed Government-control programs involving commodities in my own backyard as well as control programs that touch other parts of the country.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the colloquy between the gentleman on the other side of the aisle and the gentleman from Illinois with reference to corn. Wheat happens to be very close to my heart. Yet I always find people from either the corn area or the peanut area or the cotton area seem to know more about wheat than the people who represent the wheat producing area. I do not follow the gentleman's line of argument when he says on the one hand that peanuts are close to him, wheat is close to me, and corn is close to the gentleman from Illinois. But yet we are telling one another what should be done with reference to each commodity. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, that is exactly the point that I was making.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I just wonder whether the gentleman from Montana was saying that the gentleman from Illinois does not know anything about peanuts and yet he is telling us all about peanuts.

Mr. BATTIN. I have seen that same thing happen on the floor before, I will say to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that while I have no peanut producers in my district, to my knowledge, I do have a great many taxpayers who are deeply concerned over expensive programs like this. I have many producers who have consistently over the years opposed control programs for themselves. They have witnessed the problems that have come to the cotton producers, the tobacco producers and others in control areas and they do not want any part of it themselves. And they are also willing to have their Representative in Congress, I might add, do his best to extend the blessings of freedom to all farmers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend who has just given us a very splendid talk that he realizes, of course, that this particular legislation we are considering does not cost the taxpayers any money. This is a program that does not cost the taxpayers a dime. This legislation clearly says that we are going to permit small farmers to continue to plant a few acres of peanuts for boiling without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. We pointed out very definitely that the boiled peanut is a different type of commodity. And let me emphasize again that it has the same relationship to other peanuts that sweet corn has to field corn. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, please let me say to my colleagues that there is that very clear-cut difference. There is the great precedent that we do not count sweet corn for cooking and eating as being in the same category with field corn. This is exactly the same situation. We divide peanuts for boiling from other peanuts.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hate to take issue with my friend from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], but I believe this is a matter of principle. In this debate we may gain something, which is more than we have generally done in Congress this session. I think this is probably the turning point of the session. It has been a very hard year. We have had some very important legislation before us though I understand we have a few minor bills yet to consider. In line with the statement made by Gertrude Stein—who is not in my district—"A rose is a rose is a rose," it should follow that a peanut is a peanut is a peanut.

Nonetheless, we are asked today to extend a bill that says a peanut is not a peanut because it is a boiled peanut. These green or boiled peanuts are fed to hogs. The hogs consider them peanuts. We consider roasted peanuts as peanuts, and peanuts in peanut butter as peanuts, but by act of Congress we have declared a peanut not a peanut at all. This is a very fine distinction, in my opinion, and one that probably should be referred to some more philosophical committee than Congress, perhaps the group who delight in debating such unresolved questions as the classical one involving the number of angels who can dance on the point of a pin.

We have been in session now for over 6 months. In fact, we read, that is some of us newer Members, that we may be here until Christmas. I read just yesterday, it is not a question of when we adjourn, but is a question, if we adjourn, this year. So with 6½ months behind us, and having been described as a balk Congress, consistent with the slow moving 87th Congress, the legislative effort this year offers some hope to the taxpayer because of the old saying, "No legislation is good legislation."

It is a good thing that we set aside a day for heated debate on the boiled peanut because in just 6½ months we have already extended the draft; we have assured women equal pay for equal work; we have extended excise taxes. We passed a political feed grain program and now today we are trying to take up another very vital issue. I assume if this hot issue is disposed of, we can move on to such other minor programs as tax reduction and reform; wheat, cotton, and dairy legislation; civil rights; and a host of other important matters—not to mention later on, perhaps, adjournment.

The bill before us today, in my opinion, is symbolic of the ultimate folly of any controlled program in agriculture and should alert all Members on both sides of the aisle to the basic need of a complete overhaul of farm programs, perhaps starting with a sizable reduction in USDA personnel—maybe a 40- or 50-percent reduction. Some, including myself, doubt the advisability of Secretary Freeman leaving the country at this critical time, while others regret that he did not leave at an earlier date. But, nevertheless, he is gone. He is temporarily absent, I assume—not only at a time when peanuts are in hot water but when the wheat, cotton, and dairy farmers of America are demonstrating peacefully their interest in new voluntary legislation.

Those concerned may be interested in knowing that today Secretary Freeman is still visiting Russia. Upon landing in Moscow last Sunday, he was greeted by roving Ambassador Averell Harriman. Harriman traveled to Russia to negotiate a test ban. However, Freeman's trip may well be the forerunner of another ban soon to be imposed by the President. Nonetheless, while Orville studies progress in Russian agriculture and other world affairs, we just talk about peanuts. Shall we go down in history as a Congress that labored and la-

bored and labored and finally brought forth the peanut—a boiled one at that? And do not forget the Latin proverb—remember this—"He that would eat the kernel must crack the nut."

Let me point out this is a serious matter. We have other commodities that are boiled before sale. We have wheat that is boiled before sale, called bulgur. Some people like it. I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] was saved by the rules of the House today because not many of you had a chance to sample the boiled peanut, but nonetheless the bill is a serious threat to those under controlled programs.

Let me tell you that in the first year this little exemption was in effect, the number of farmers raising boiled peanuts jumped from 1,285 to 1,861 and the total acreage jumped from 1,667 to 2,662. This is a sizable increase and not one we can laugh about and say is not important to agriculture generally.

It seems to me the nut of the whole thing is this. We have talked about supply management. Mr. Freeman talks about supply management. Efforts were made to force it upon the wheat farmers of America including those in the State of Kansas. They turned it down. Even Members of Congress who vote for supply management turn it down, in effect, when they come in and ask us to exempt their farmers from supply management. If it is good for some farmers, it should be good for all farmers. I think the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] goes to the very heart of the matter. The production of boiled peanuts is no less and no more than the production of other peanuts. I do not think anybody including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] can state any real difference between a boiled peanut and a regular peanut. We do have something at stake here today despite the fact that the bill does not affect many people for it does basically affect the American agricultural scene and the farmers desire for freedom.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. SNYDER. I would like to agree with what you said about the rules of the House saving the gentleman from Florida. I had the pleasure of tasting one of those things and I wonder if there is any possibility of calling up a public health bill later on?

Mr. DOLE. Well, there may be. I think, perhaps—I do not know—but some people like these peanuts. I understand they are a delicacy. They are eaten by many people and are raised in many States.

Mr. Chairman, I have read all the debate the past 6 years on boiled peanuts and apparently many people seem to eat them and survive.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman and his predecessor referred to the cost of this program. I think it might be interesting to the Members of the Com-

mittee to know that the rate of loss under the peanut program of the Commodity Credit Corporation averages almost 14 percent of the total value of the peanut crop. The total value of the controlled peanut crop is \$180 million. The realized losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation—and that does not include the administrative expenses and other hidden costs—is \$25 million, or about 14 percent of the value of the crop.

Furthermore, the Members of the Committee might be interested to know that peanuts in foreign markets sell at about half price. They are supported at about 12 cents a pound here at home, but they sell for about 6 cents a pound abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have the consumers of this country to think about.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with the gentleman. He is exactly correct. Many believed the 15-acre wheat producer was no problem, but today it is admitted the 15-acre wheat producer has created a problem for nearly everyone.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out also that if you have a 5-acre peanut allotment, you can plant it to peanuts and in addition to the 5-acre peanut planting, you can plant "boiled peanuts" outside your allotment without penalty. In other words, you can exceed your allotment and not be penalized. This bill permits an exemption from the present program and its controls.

Mr. Chairman, there has been opposition in the past from other peanut States. Perhaps the time will come when we will have 8,000, 9,000, or 10,000 farmers raising boiled peanuts, and then it may be too late for those in Virginia, South Carolina, and North Carolina, and California—to do anything about it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 8, strike the period and insert the following: "and the first paragraph of such Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: 'Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of this subparagraph (C), the exemption provided for boiled peanuts shall also apply to all peanuts produced.'"

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, the bill simply deals with a class of peanuts. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The bill simply

deals with a class of peanuts. The amendment deals with an entirely different class, and is not in order, as it would change the entire concept of the legislation, as well as wipe out the peanut program.

For that reason, the amendment is not germane to this bill that is before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

My argument is based on the fact that my amendment is offered to a part of the act of April 13, 1957. The title of the bill itself states as its purpose to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It states as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938", approved August 13, 1957, as amended, is amended—

And so on.

So I believe it follows this is truly an amendment to the act which the bill itself would amend. For the Chair's convenience, I quote the act of 1957, which states:

The word "peanuts" for the purposes of this Act shall mean all peanuts produced, excluding any peanuts which it is established by the producer or otherwise, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, were not picked or threshed either before or after marketing from the farm, or were marketed by the producer before drying or removal of moisture from such peanuts either by natural or artificial means for consumption exclusively as boiled peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLYNT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment to the pending bill.

As a general rule, one individual proposition may not be amended by any other individual proposition, even though the two may belong to the same class.

The Chair quotes from volume 8, section 2948, the following:

To a bill amendatory of one section of an existing law an amendment proposing further modification of the law was held not to be germane.

On December 20, 1919, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union was considering the bill (H.R. 11224) to amend section 1 of the act approved October 16, 1918, providing for deportation of alien anarchists.

Mr. Benjamin F. Welty, of Ohio, offered an amendment proposing to add to the existing law a new section to be known as section 4.

Mr. Albert Johnson, of Washington, made the point of order that the amendment while germane to the existing law was not germane to the pending bill.

Accordingly, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct that the Chair's ruling was based on the point that the amendment I offered was confined to a paragraph instead of a section? I call the attention of the Chair to the fact the 1958 act added a new section to the 1930 act. This amendment is to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair ruled that the amendment was not germane to the pending bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: On page 1, line 8, strike the period and insert the following: "and the first paragraph of such Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: 'Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the exemption from acreage allotments and marketing quotas as provided for herein for boiled peanuts shall also apply to any agricultural commodity, which prior to being marketed as a foodstuff is boiled and dried.'"

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane and it is apparent on its face. This amendment deals not only with peanuts but with all commodities, therefore, it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Adopting the same argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], in reference to a certain commodity, which is boiled peanuts, I call attention again to the use of these peanuts, which is boiling. We have boiled potatoes, boiled apricots, and many other commodities boiled prior to sale. If we can do this for one commodity, I think we can do it for all commodities.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLYNT). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would extend the legislation to other commodities than those covered by the pending legislation. While the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would amend the general law, the Chair rules that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it now appears my amendment to this bill, at least along the lines affording the blessings of freedom to all peanut farmers, is going to be difficult if not impossible. Assuming all efforts in this direction do fail, I would like to urge my colleagues to vote "No" on this bill in deference to our long-suffering taxpayers and consumers.

I would like to remind Members that we have presently \$17,057,940 tied up in Government peanut stocks. The Department of Agriculture has predicted a rise in the surplus stocks as a result of this year's crop, and every peanut produced on exemption acres, such as provided in this bill, increases the burden on the taxpayers indirectly through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The peanut control program has been excessively costly. It has represented a cost of about \$14 for every \$100 worth of peanuts produced in the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are coming to the close of debate on this bill and I would just like again to point out that all we are talking about is the extension for a period of 2 years of a law that has been passed on the Consent Calendar for the past three Congresses. This is a bill that was approved by every member of the House Committee on Agriculture, some 35 in number, with the exception of 3 at the most; a bill that was unanimously reported by the subcommittee which considered it; a bill which will not cost the taxpayers one dime; a bill that, admitting it is not a bill of importance all over the country, is nevertheless of importance to many hundreds of people. I seriously hope that the House will unanimously approve the extension of this law.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. DOLE. Would you be inclined to support a bill that might do the same for boiled wheat?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me say to my friend if you will bring it before the Committee on Agriculture and get them to approve it, I will be delighted to support it. Now, will you approve my bill, which was approved by everybody on the committee except you and two other gentlemen?

Mr. DOLE. Sir, I might do that if I do not have to eat the peanuts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman has my permission never to eat the peanuts, although I hope he will change his mind.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I assume the gentleman is interested in getting votes for the bill. I want to support it. I understand there are 2,600 acres involved?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No, sir. About 3,000.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Only 3,000? Having sampled these peanuts, will you guarantee me that if I vote for this bill you will never plant over 3,000 acres?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The bill will come up for consideration in 2 years, and let me say in all sincerity that is the reason why we had a 2-year extension, that is, because at that time 2 years from now, I have the feeling if there are more acres planted the committee probably will not approve the bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think we can stand over 3,000 acres.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Actually this matter

of excepting boiled peanuts from the general law is not without precedent. We have excepted Durum wheat. For many years we excepted all wheat grown on tracts under 15 acres. If we had such an exception as that in this instance this bill certainly would not be necessary. We have excepted long staple cotton for many many years. We have excepted certain Flue-fired tobacco. This is really no exception. Peanuts for hogging purposes have been grown without reference to marketing quota laws for years and years. Wheat for grazing purposes, which is plowed under and never allowed to go to harvest, has been permitted under the law. This is a peculiar crop. It is just simply a matter of exempting a form of a product which is not in competition with and has nothing to do with the general product covered by marketing quota legislation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank our distinguished majority leader for those remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for a city fellow I have been following this debate with great fascination. I have listened to my handsome and able young friends from Illinois and Kansas who have covered the entire political waterfront. They have taken the peanut into the civil rights debate. They have rolled it over to Europe where Averell Harriman is in talks that may mean the security of this country from atomic warfare. And I am wondering if there is a historic significance in all of this, if today we are hearing for the first time that in the campaign next year the slogan and the insignia of the great Republican Party will no longer be the elephant, large and rampant, but the little boiled peanut.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 101) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 pursuant to House Resolution 401, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 582) to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1957, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended by striking out "and 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963, 1964, and 1965".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 101) was laid on the table.

GRAVE QUESTIONS THE PRESIDENT SHOULD ANSWER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a more serious moment or a more grave occasion for me to take the floor of the House in behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, whom I have the honor to represent, as well as all the people of the United States. In my opinion the very future of this Nation is hanging in the balance. In this perilous time I am trying to measure my words carefully so that the full impact of what is happening may be known to the people and in the hope that the President may clarify his ultimate objective in his attitude toward the revolution, armed revolution in some cases, which is now going on in the United States. Mr. President, are you now using the civil rights problem as an avenue for setting up a socialist dictatorship?

At this point in my remarks, I would like to include an article by David Lawrence, "Use of U.S. Troops a Question," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1963.

USE OF U.S. TROOPS A QUESTION

(By David Lawrence)

Is the administration about to acknowledge that it was wrong in sending Federal troops to Mississippi? If not, why were the military forces of the United States not sent to preserve order and prevent further bloodshed in the racial crisis in Cambridge, Md., as they were in Oxford, Miss.?

The argument made by the administration in ordering troops to Mississippi was that the entry of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi might cause disorder. None had previously occurred, but it was the mere threat of it which prompted the sending of a large number of Federal troops to the area and later to the university campus and the town of Oxford. Many of these soldiers are still there, presumably to protect against possible disorder.

In the case of Cambridge, "demonstrations" and racial clashes have been going on for more than a month. The Department of Justice had appealed in vain to the Negro leaders not to stir things up. The State militia had been on duty in the town for a

while but was withdrawn when it seemed that mediation of some kind was in prospect. A Department of Justice official tried to bring the factions together, but without success. On Thursday night, new disorder erupted and the town was terrorized for several hours with shooting described by the commander of the State police on the scene as "almost on the scale of warfare." At least five persons were wounded by gunfire. Three were members of the Maryland National Guard, which has been called back to the scene, and limited martial law has been imposed.

The Federal Government had, of course, no legal right to send troops into Mississippi. There was no "insurrection," and the Governor of the State had not, as the Constitution requires, requested aid. He had forces ready to quell disturbances. But the administration, claiming it has the authority in law and in constitutional provisions, has kept troops at the University of Mississippi for many months now.

If the Federal Government has a lawful right to send troops anywhere in the United States during a racial crisis on the theory that the principles of the 14th amendment must be enforced, then it is difficult to understand why such troops have not been ordered as a preventive measure not only to Maryland but to New York City, where a reign of terror has prevailed in certain neighborhoods. The same kind of disturbances, with violence involved, have been reported also from other areas in different parts of the country where there is racial conflict.

Many lawyers have inspired that the preservation of law and order within a State is the function of the Governor and the State militia, only to be told that this is just a legal technicality. President Kennedy is quoted as having said, "After all, it's right." The doctrine expounded here is that "the end justifies the means," unfortunately, even this doctrine is not uniformly applied.

The Negro leaders, for instance, who sponsor the demonstrations are careful to emphasize in their public statements that they are proceeding on a nonviolent basis. But when feelings are aroused, nonviolence is superseded by violence. As the New York Times—supporter of integration—said in an editorial, "nonviolence that deliberately provokes violence is a logical contradiction."

In Cambridge, white persons sitting on the porch of their homes have been the targets of gunfire, and two men were wounded by blasts from an automatic shotgun during last Thursday night's disorder. Three National Guardsmen were wounded when the car in which they were returning from drill duty at a nearby armory was ambushed with rifle and shotgun fire. They were in uniform but unarmed.

Negro leaders are putting on demonstrations in various cities in memory of one of their colleagues, Medgar Evers, who was killed in Mississippi by a sniper's bullet. But there seems to be no public recognition by any group of the plight of those white persons—most of them innocent bystanders—killed or wounded in recent weeks in connection with racial disturbances. Nor have steps been taken to call a halt to the nonviolent demonstrations that are steadily producing the violence.

As for the further use of Federal troops to quell or prevent the outbreak of disorder, official Washington is mum. Will the people of the District of Columbia have the protection of Federal troops on August 28 when 100,000 Negroes are expected to participate in a nonviolent demonstration in Washington? Apparently only Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama get the benefit of the presence of Federal troops. The equal right to protection doesn't seem to extend to citizens elsewhere who may be threatened with nonviolent demonstrations in which violence can result in injury to innocent persons.

Mr. Speaker, there are several pertinent questions raised by Mr. Lawrence in his article: "Why did the President use Federal troops in Mississippi and Alabama because violence was threatened? Why has he failed to use troops in Cambridge, Md., Philadelphia, Pa., New York City, Savannah, Ga., and in North Carolina where there is violence and where people have been shot and killed?"

The omissions and commissions of President Kennedy in the struggle now going on in America take on added significance when we review the history of his administration.

From the day of his inauguration President Kennedy has demanded and/or seized more and more power for the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch. A review of Presidential messages and White House-sponsored legislation establishes this as a fact. Also a fact is that the delegation of such broad powers to the executive establishes an easy course to dictatorship.

One of the keymen around President Kennedy is Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Mr. Schlesinger is an admitted advocate of what he calls "democratic socialism," and his views have never been contradicted by the President. Mr. President, I ask you now, Do you support a change in our form of society from a private enterprise system to that of a planned economy or democratic socialism?

With this background of boldly seeking new Executive powers and keeping as one of his counselors an advocate of a socialist system, the President now confronts us with the puzzle of his handling of the civil rights issue. There is no doubt that the Kennedy political machine used civil rights as an effective campaign technique in the 1960 election. There are none that I know of who will deny the Kennedy administration has manipulated the civil rights issue in an attempt to hog-tie the majority of the Negro vote in advance of the 1964 election. Can anyone deny the President's handling of the current mob action has not been weighted to encourage the Negroes and to discriminate against whites? Witness the haste with which Federal forces were sent to Mississippi against the authority of State officials and before any overt action had been taken. Witness the fact that Federal troops were mobilized in Alabama against the expressed desire of the Governor and before the scheduled entrance of Negroes into the university. Witness the absolute silence from the White House in even mildly condemning the destruction of property, the injuring and killing of white people by rock-throwing, car-burning, rifle-shooting Negroes. Why, Mr. President?

If your purpose in Mississippi and Alabama was to preserve law and order and to protect the lives and property of the people, why are you not concerned with the violation of law, the destruction of property, and murder in other States where violence has been engendered and carried out by Negroes? Is not such blatant partiality encouraging more rioting, more violence, more violation of law and order? What can the

Nation hope to gain by an increase of such violence? What can you gain, Mr. President?

Now, let us go a step further in pointing out significant events and statements. On last Sunday evening on WTTG-TV there was a panel discussion of "Race Relations and Crisis." Four prominent Negro leaders, three of whom are now involved in the nationwide demonstrations, explained their purposes and objectives. They plainly stated we must have forced integration; they ridiculed legislative remedies; they insisted on compensatory treatment for the colored race by declaring that "unqualified Negroes must be given preferential treatment in hiring and that they be made qualified on the job." To achieve these objectives these leaders of the nonviolent movement said they intend to continue and to increase the tempo of the demonstrations until all the demands are met, they promised further violence and talked of the use of guns to strengthen their fight; they emphasized the size, strength and determination of the proposed march on Washington next month to obtain this ultimate objective. These Negro leaders made it plain their demands are paramount to the interest of the preservation of our system of society by stating it may be necessary to implement action on the demands of the Negroes for preferential treatment with a military dictatorship or some kind of Socialist state.

In view of these statements, Mr. President, I call upon you now to state your objectives in supporting these leaders. Are the American people to construe your silence in regard to the violent demonstrations now going on and the potential violence which lurks in the proposed march on Washington as encouraging an increase in the tempo of the demonstrations and the violence? If so, for what purpose? Will you disavow, now, that you intend to use a complete breakdown in law and order on August 28 or some subsequent date as an excuse for seizing complete power? Your failure to act, Mr. President, when the rights of whites are being assaulted and the speed with which you act when, in your opinion, Negro rights are threatened, are the basis for these questions which are now in the minds of many of our people.

For the security of the Nation, for the protection of the freedoms and the rights of all the people, for the preservation of our system of society, a republic within a democracy, Congress must know and the people must know, now, how far the President intends to go in seizing power or in changing our form of government in solving the civil rights issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out once more, as I have frequently reminded the Negro people that they will equally be the losers with the whites if, for whatever purpose it is achieved, they succeed in destroying this Republic. Under a dictatorship, they too, will be enslaved and they, too, along with the whites will lose all their freedoms and the God-given rights with which we are endowed.

I have made this statement, and posed these questions, not to charge President Kennedy with seeking to become a dictator, but to call to his attention, in the event he has failed thus far to recognize

it, to the possible results of the course he is following. It is important, too, that these words of warning be given to the American people so that they will not lose their freedoms without ever having recognized that they were in danger of losing them.

The pressure of history is upon us at this moment and only a strong willed people and leaders dedicated to the preservation of this land of freedom with all its traditions of inherent liberty can save the cause of freedom in the world.

Mr. President, in the name of America, in the name of humanity, show the American people now, by your words and your deeds, that you intend to protect this Republic in keeping with the oath you took to preserve the Constitution against all its enemies, both foreign and domestic.

SOUND FEED GRAIN AND WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this morning the members of the Indiana congressional delegation and our two Senators had the pleasure of having breakfast with the Indiana Farm Bureau leaders who are here for their convention and their legislative studies. Following breakfast, Mr. George Doup, our very distinguished president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, made some wonderful suggestions, which I insert in the RECORD at this point.

Passage of sound feed grain and wheat legislation this session of Congress is of paramount importance.

In view of this need, a very adequate bill has been introduced by my colleague from Indiana, Congressman RALPH HARVEY of the 10th Indiana District.

This proposed legislation has the full support and endorsement of the Indiana Farm Bureau which is holding a conference this week in Washington on farm legislation.

This cropland retirement proposal includes the following outstanding features:

First. An opportunity for U.S. farmers to retire up to some 60 to 80 million acres of cropland voluntarily and without Government coercion.

Second. Emphasis is placed upon the retirement of whole farms, so that the incentive to "push" the remaining acreage and in the long run increase total production is removed.

Third. Maximum limitations on land retirement in any State or county is provided to prevent depressed communities.

Fourth. Grazing or harvesting of crops from retired acres is prohibited.

Fifth. Retirement contracts between the farmer and the U.S. Government would be for a minimum of 3 years.

Sixth. The legislation provides for retirement of sufficient acreage to assure adjustment of production of farm products to demand.

Other important features of the cropland retirement proposal discussed by members of the Indiana congressional delegation and officials of the Indiana Farm Bureau at the farm legislation conference in Washington, D.C., this week.

Mr. George Doup, of Columbus, Ind., the very able and respected president of the Indiana Farm Bureau had some highly informative and useful comments on provisions of H.R. 6994.

Mr. Doup said the bill would terminate acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat and feed grains, and would repeal the 1964-65 feed grain diversion program, which is of little value.

This outstanding farm leader also reported that under the cropland retirement proposal, feed grain prices would be supported by the Government at a realistic level—90 percent of the past 3-year average market price, but not less than 50 percent of parity.

These provisions provide a floor under prices of these grains, but do not encourage unneeded production for the Government support price alone.

Mr. Doup also said:

In order to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from dumping surplus grain on the open market and driving that price which farmers receive to an unreasonably low figure, the Farm Bureau program provides that Government stocks could not be released for less than 115 percent of the support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. This means that if the price support under Farm Bureau's program were \$1.35 per bushel, then farmers could receive from the open market as much as nearly \$1.70 per bushel before the Government could sell surplus stocks and drive the market lower. There would probably be little wheat or feed-grains going to Government storage for the lower support price.

The cost of the 1963 feed-grain program, and the certificate wheat program voted down so decisively by wheat farmers in May would have cost \$1.5 billion and would have placed the management of U.S. farms under the control of USDA. Farm Bureau's cropland retirement will cost much less than that, and if the entire package is adopted will undoubtedly solve the problems which plague wheat and feed-grain producers.

The House Wheat Subcommittee has scheduled hearings on wheat legislation July 23, and it is hoped that they will give favorable consideration to H.R. 6994.

In addition to Mr. Doup, officials of the Indiana Farm Bureau meeting with the Indiana congressional delegation this week included Glenn W. Sample, Zionsville, vice president; Mrs. Guy E. Gross, Churubusco, second vice president; George R. Harvey, Speedway, secretary-treasurer; Charles E. Riddle, Argos; George Neff, Goshen; Lawrence Holloway, Colfax; Carlin Schoeff, Montpelier; Harmon Rogers, New Ross; Evan Wilson, Pendleton; Edward Kuhn, Bicknell; George Ruschhaupt, New Palestine; Warren Wheaton, Oakland City; Linville Bryant, Versailles, and C. W. Stall, Danville, director of information for Indiana Farm Bureau.

"ARC-54, WHERE ARE YOU?"

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is my duty to report the full details of one of the most brazen attempts to rob the public Treasury since the days of Teapot Dome.

At least \$10 million has been saved for the taxpayers of the United States by cancellation of the most outlandish sole source—noncompetitive—procurement that it has been my duty to study during the last 2 years. I am able to report to my colleagues today that the savings has already been effected. The procurement has been stopped, and I think any future buy of the equipment—the airborne radio AN/ARC-54—will be opened to the force of competition.

In this one procurement:

I have found a development contract of over \$2.6 million for the radio which was followed by an order canceling delivery of the very materials for which the Government paid dearly. Thus, the military set up procedures assuring a sole-source production contract to the developer and tried to keep its skirts clean so it could say "no technical material available" and escape the consequences.

I have found a secret \$4.6 million sole-source production contract to the developer of the radio. This was carried out without any public announcement and safeguards were taken to see that industry didn't find out about the transaction.

I have found a false certification citing as the reason for the sole-source purchase that the radios are needed for mounting in aircraft between April and November of next year. The radios need not be available until 6 months before the planes are due for completion and that the contracts for the manufacture of the planes have not even been awarded as yet.

When the planes are ordered, they are to be delivered in December 1965, which means that the first radios would not be needed until June 1965—not November 1964 as stated by Army officials.

I have found a second proposed sole-source award for more of the radios which would have totaled at least \$22 million. When I attacked the fallaciousness of this second proposed purchase, Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Agency, canceled it in entirety and is still looking into the matter.

I have found there is still no fixed price for the radio under the first sole-source contract. The radio is being built under terms of a "letter contract" which has yet to be finalized.

I have found that there are serious questions about the actions of military and civilian officials which should be resolved before this matter is closed.

Mr. Speaker, there, in brief, you have the details on which I shall now elaborate. I hope to paint a complete and easily understood picture for you.

Here is the cast of characters:

Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Command in Philadelphia, who is soon to move up to a higher position.

delphia, who is soon to move up to a higher position.

Mrs. Mary Regan, a contracting officer in Philadelphia, who has been employed by the Government for 21 years.

Maj. Herbert Sheer, who in 1960 was a contracting officer for the old U.S. Army Signal Supply Agency in Philadelphia.

There are various other names which will appear, but these are the people I shall deal with. Behind them are faceless electronics engineers who will come to light if and when this matter is delved into thoroughly by the proper committee of Congress.

Before I am through here today, Mr. Speaker, you might well be asking, "Can it be our Army doing this?" You will be shaking your head in frustration, cognizant of the fact that the so-called industrial-military complex of which a former great President warned us is, indeed, becoming a monolithic ogre which, unchecked, can threaten the very lifeblood of our existence.

Mr. Speaker, "Can it be our Army doing this?"

It is the same Army that wasted at least \$17 million buying the tank-mounted AN/VRC-12 radio set by sole-source methods after promising faithfully to buy the same set competitively.

It is the same Army that wasted over \$10 million buying the AN/PRC-25 walkie-talkie radio without competition before being pushed into competitive buying.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is the same Army that was planning to soak the taxpayer with at least a \$10 million sole-source overcharge for the airborne AN/ARC-54, the third piece of equipment that makes up the VRC-12, PRC-25 communications complex.

This, of course, was before I uncovered the rotten foundations used to support a platform whose principal plank was, "We must, in the best interests of national defense and security, buy this radio from one supplier without competition."

Mr. Speaker, is the military-industrial complex growing in power? There can be no other conclusion when you see the way in which facts have been distorted, truth kicked into the ashcan and the well-being of the taxpayer thrown to the winds so that business could be channeled to a favored company.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the United States as a corporate entity. Robert S. McNamara, for example, is the Defense Department's chief executive officer. President Kennedy is our corporation's president. We here in Congress are members of the board of directors. The people are the shareholders.

As members of the board, we in Congress have a right and an obligation to object to and demand the elimination of waste in defense purchasing, particularly that kind of blatant waste and incredible logistic stupidity found in the at least \$22 million sole-source contract I referred to a moment ago.

Thankfully, this particular procurement has been canceled because I was able to catch civilian and military servants in manipulations and falsifications before the waste was perpetrated.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed purchase that was stopped and the \$4.6 million sole-source award for the same AN/ARC-54 radio that immediately preceded it, are the prime examples of what is rotten in the Pentagon today.

They are also meaningful examples of why this Congress needs a new blue-ribbon joint committee to act as a watchdog over all such negotiated defense and space contracts which make up such a staggering proportion of our annual defense budget.

Anyone who watches the TV program, "What's My Line," knows that the U.S. Government is not a profitmaking corporation. No one is more aware of that than we here in Congress who annually tangle with the red-ink budgets sent up for action by the White House.

But while the Government is not set up as a profitmaking institution, neither was it founded with long-range national bankruptcy in mind. Nevertheless, that seems to be the way we are headed under the impetus of ever-increasing expenditures for national defense which now takes almost half of every tax dollar.

While everyone agrees that we must stay strong to maintain the peace, there seems to have arisen a corollary axiom that "the more we spend the stronger we are," and I disagree strongly with that particular tenet.

I suppose that the converse of this theory is that anyone who opposes the constantly growing Defense budget weakens our defense posture and must be a subversive, a mercenary, or an odd-ball. During the 2 years that I have been successfully conducting an often lonely critique of waste in defense procurement, the Pentagon has openly but unsuccessfully tried to brand me as one or all of the foregoing.

Fortunately, none of the Pentagon's theories are true. The defense budget is so rife with waste, so padded with unneeded or overly expensive procurements that in most areas a cut of up to one-third could be made without diluting our military posture one drop.

Some of the waste is unintentional and results from a lack of coordination, bungling, and stupidity in our vast Defense Establishment. But some of the waste is not so accidental. This waste, under whatever guise, invariably enriches some who sell the Government the goods or services involved at a price, or in a quantity, in excess of what the Government needs.

In these latter situations—the same as at Arthur Murray's—it takes two to tango. And there are willing middle-grade civil or military servants ready to dance to a contractor's tune with the promise of immediate gain or a plush job in the future dangled as bait. All this has the end result of bilking the American taxpayer out of more and more of his already inflated dollars.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the broad picture. Now to the details of the AN/ARC-54, after which I shall leave it to the conclusion of Congress and the public as to which category of waste—intentional or unintentional—is involved.

As I mentioned before, the AN/ARC-54 is the airborne unit of what can best

be described as a three-way communication system that includes the AN/VRC-12 vehicular radio and the AN/PRC-25 walkie-talkie radio. Utilizing these three newly produced units, soldiers in the field can communicate with each other, with mobile forces and with aerial support.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, all three radios have something in common besides their mission of intercommunication. As I have explained in this House in recent weeks, and as Congress confirmed by cutting \$10.2 million from the Army's 1964 electronics appropriation, each of these units was developed at Government expense and then put out for first production to the developer on a sole-source basis involving millions of dollars in waste and penalty to the taxpayer.

When purchase of first the VRC-12 and later the PRC-25 was exposed to competition—as they should have been in the first place—the price to the Army—and the taxpayer—was cut in half or better. This same pattern will be repeated for the ARC-54. Fortunately, the chances are excellent this will occur faster than in the case of the VRC-12 and PRC-25.

Over \$120 million was ladled out sole-source before the first two units experienced the fresh, clean breezes of competitive bidding. On the ARC-54 only one small contract for \$4.6 million was secretly—and I want to emphasize the word "secretly"—pushed through at the end of fiscal 1963 before its stench reached my nostrils.

When the Army tried to follow up the \$4.6 million sole-source deal with a second contract which could have gone to \$22 million or higher, its justification was so spurious and its maneuvers to freeze out competition so flagrant that it was possible to demand—successfully—that the Army halt the procurement immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the ARC-54 was put out for development in 1956, under terms of a research and development contract awarded to Collins Radio Corp. of Dallas, Tex. Payments under that contract eventually totaled \$2,633,481.

By October 1961 my sources in the Pentagon and industry told me development was virtually complete, so I wrote the Army asking what its plans were for production procurement of the unit. This letter was written because I knew only too well the Army's proclivity toward the award of wasteful sole-source first-run production contracts to developers of the equipment, and I wanted to start urging competition at the first possible moment.

In answer I was told that no procurement of the ARC-54 was planned in fiscal 1962 because of a shortage of funds.

On April 26, 1963, I again heard of the ARC-54 when I learned that the Army had, on March 26, 1963, secretly awarded the developer of the radio a letter contract for production of up to 900 of the radios—a figure later changed to 1,153—and had earmarked \$4,643,400 for the purchase. Such a method of funding usually represents about half of the total price to be paid for the equipment, so we can look forward to paying over \$9 mil-

lion for the first run under normal circumstances. I say "under normal circumstances" because there is no way to tell how the price will be manipulated after the disclosures of today.

The Army did not at that time announce its letter contract in any of the usual media as procurement regulations normally require. It handed the letter contract to the manufacturer—fully committing the Government and authorizing Collins to proceed with production arrangements—even before it had received a quotation as to how much Collins would charge for the unit. In other words, the producer was given carte blanche with the taxpayers' money with the price to be agreed on in the future.

On May 23, after I had protested such an action, the Army Materiel Command's Chicago procurement district finally got around to putting out a request for proposal to Collins, raising the number to 1,153 and asking Collins to quote a price.

All copies of that document were stamped in red: "Do not display." This meant that no procurement official anywhere was to post this document so the public or other producers could see it. The reason, I think, should be obvious. The Army did not want the secrecy of this transaction further violated for fear competitors or anyone else knowledgeable in procurement would see it and raise the roof.

Mr. Speaker, some of the statements contained in that procurement document, the earlier justification for sole-source award, and some of the answers to my questions based on the procurement papers are so fallacious, so contrived and so unwarranted that I wonder that anyone in the Army would have the gall to pull this deal off. I can only conclude that the Army did not expect to have to answer for its actions—that it hoped to keep the whole deal under the table until it was too late to ask questions.

Here are a few examples of the statements made by the Army and the real facts: On the outside chance some contractor might learn of the impending procurement and ask for a bid set, the proposal states:

First, "Drawings are not available" which means that there are no blueprints to be looked at by anyone wanting to prepare a bid.

Second, That there is what is called a "service test model" but it is owned by Collins Radio. This means the model, which might be used to prepare an intelligent bid even in the absence of drawings, was Collins' private property and not available for inspection by any competitor.

Third, There is available a specification for the equipment, but there is page after page of "exceptions" to the specification and to the model. That specification is dated February 17, 1963, and was thus obviously prepared long after the exceptions to it were dictated by the Army. Yet it was not revised.

Mr. Speaker, how could all of this be true?

As a matter of fact, on page 3 of the development contract awarded in 1956, it is stated that drawings of the equipment

are to be prepared and given to the Government. It is further specified that they are to be of sufficient detail, quality, and clarity to permit manufacture and assembly of the ARC-54 by any other manufacturer from those drawings alone.

And what of the model? An amendment to the development contract, attached in 1957, calls for production of 30—I repeat, 30—service test models, and they are all to be the property of the Government.

All this, of course, was standard procedure. Who ever heard of the Government's paying private industry \$2.6 million to develop a piece of equipment with the end product—here a radio—to be owned by the contractor?

I will tell you one man who heard of it. Maj. Herbert Sheer, who, until April 30, 1961, was an Army officer. He is now retired.

My investigation disclosed that on February 17, 1960, the Army suddenly terminated most of this contract, eliminating the requirement for the manufacturing drawings, most of the test models and virtually every other item of benefit to be gained from the contract except a thick stack of reports useless to any competitor trying to break into competition for production of the radio. It was Major Sheer who signed the order literally "gutting" the produce of the development contract.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, after 3½ years, when development was near completion, and after \$2.6 million had been spent by the Army, the project was canceled and Collins was permitted to keep the drawings and models it was paid to develop.

Why was this outrage perpetrated? The Army now blandly says that it "ran out of funds" at that time.

Since this radio was to be a vital link in an ultramodern battlefield communications system, was the contract revived once funds became available? With multimillion-dollar contracts being awarded for the other two radios, was development work on the ARC-54 started again? Of course it was not.

Although the Army knew of the impending need for the equipment, nothing was done until early this year. Then somebody in the Pentagon is supposed to have suddenly awakened to the fact that the Air Force was planning to build some planes and there had better be some ARC-54's to go in them so the pilots could talk to troops on the ground.

It is here that Mary Regan takes over. She is a contracting officer for the U.S. Army Materiel Support Agency in Philadelphia, the group that handles most of the procurement for the Army's new electronics command—the successor to most of the old Signal Corps' functions.

Mary Regan looked at papers submitted to her covering this problem. She made sure all the initials were in the proper places. She was positive all the names were signed to all the bundles of papers. Then she signed a "Determination and Findings (D. & F.)" calling for the sole-source award of a production contract for the ARC-54 to Collins Radio Corp.

In this incredible document, Mary Regan states the "required delivery schedule" demands first deliveries in April 1964 with the last of the 900 radios to be delivered in November 1964.

She stated:

This delivery schedule is based on production of Army aircraft in which the radio sets must be installed. Failure to meet this schedule will be the direct cause of the aircraft's not being deployed to overseas tactical missions to assure full combat readiness of our overseas troops.

You would assume from this, as did I, that the Army or Air Force had outstanding contracts for air frames and that these radios were urgently needed so those planes could fly to protect our country. If that were true, it would be a serious logistics error. It takes much longer to build a plane than it does to build a radio to go inside it, so the radios should have been ordered long, long ago when aircraft production was first planned.

However farfetched this might seem, it could have happened that way.

However, I have learned in the last 2 years of my procurement study never to take anything for granted. I requested a report on specific airplane production for which these radios were intended. I asked for identification of the aircraft, copies of production contracts and delivery schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the answer I received.

You will recall, Mary Regan's D. & F. states that these radios have to start coming off production lines in April of 1964. Yet the report from Brig. Gen. Walter E. Lotz, Jr., deputy commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Command, dated July 9, 1963, shows the following:

The radios do not have to be available until 6 months before the planes involved are due for completion—for delivery.

The contracts for production of the aircraft involved have not even been awarded as yet.

When they are awarded, the first aircraft into which these radios will be installed will not be scheduled for delivery until December 1965, which means that the first radios would not be needed for those aircraft until June 1966.

Yet, Mary Regan contended delivery was absolutely necessary in April 1964—14 months earlier.

Now, the logical question is, "Why would Mary Regan, or anyone else who advised her, state that the first of those radios were needed in April 1964 instead of 14 months later, June 1965?" I must state that I cannot directly answer that question. But I do know that setting a delivery date of April 1964 enabled Mary Regan, or someone, to have an excuse—justified or otherwise—for contending that only the developer—Collins—could produce the radios quick enough for the Army.

On the other hand, if that same 14 months additional leadtime for first deliveries had been permitted, dozens of other firms—responsible competitors—would have hustled in with bids that history proves would have been far lower than the sole-source price that will be demanded in negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I was outraged when I read that report on the proposed air-frame production and noted its relevance to the so-called "urgent requirement" used to justify the sole-source award. Imagine my feelings then when I later learned that was only half the story. On June 19 Mary Regan and company put out another request for proposal—this time on a contract calling for production of up to 2,964 units of the ARC-54 with an option of 50 percent. This means up to 4,500 radios could be ordered on that one contract. At estimated prices supplied me by the electronics industry, this could run between \$22 million and \$40 million.

This was an outrage even too blatant for the Pentagon. I relayed my thoughts and my facts and figures backing them up to General Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency in Philadelphia, an officer who has been cooperative in my past studies. General Stanwix-Hay apparently agreed with me because he has informed me that he has canceled that second proposed procurement. That is where things now stand.

Since such heat has been generated regarding this procurement, the Army has still not negotiated prices for the ARC-54. That contract is still in a state of limbo, which leads me to wonder—in the fashion of the popular television program—"ARC-54, Where Are You?"

In order to find out where it is and to get to the bottom of this, I am ready to turn over my files in this case to Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., and his Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. With it, I can also turn over my strong recommendation that Mary Regan, Maj. Herbert Sheer, and everyone else involved in the development and production contracts for this radio—from the lowest engineer to the highest general, to officials of the contracting company—be brought to Washington for hearings to explain how an incredible sequence of events such as I have described can be allowed to occur.

Mr. Speaker, the conduct of public business should, as much as possible, be conducted in full view of the public. This under-the-table sole-source nonsense must be reduced to an absolute minimum. And the way to do this is to penalize those who make false justifications and certifications whether by design or error.

Mary Regan and ex-Maj. Herbert Sheer, together with hundreds of other civil servants in positions of trust, are slowly driving us down the road to bankruptcy. People such as these must be taught that when they spend \$3 million for a development contract, they had better come up with a model, plans, and drawings to insure competitive bidding. As things now stand, the Mary Regans and the Maj. Herbert Sheers can act with impunity, make mistakes, or accomplish calculated deceptions and get away scot-free.

If there ever was a case that illustrates the need for the joint congressional watchdog committee I mentioned at the outset of my presentation, it is this one. The senior Senator from New Jersey,

CLIFFORD CASE, has introduced similar legislation in the other body. My bill bears the No. H.R. 4409. Another bill I have introduced gives the General Accounting Office before-the-fact authority to upset just such sole-source crimes as this one. It is numbered H.R. 5258.

When these bills come up for hearings—and I am hopeful the Armed Services Committee will now take up H.R. 5258, using this case as a vehicle—I hope every Member will give them close scrutiny and study. I am also hopeful the Rules Committee will now schedule H.R. 4409 for hearings, since I feel I have demonstrated the need for this legislation.

Such a committee as I have suggested, such a change in procurement law as I have introduced, will be able to force countless contracts into healthy competition, opening the door for savings totaling billions of dollars. It will also help restore the power of Congress over the staggering military and space budgets, expenditures which are forcing our Government ever deeper into debt, even in these years of unprecedented prosperity.

Equally important, such legislation, as H.R. 4409 and H.R. 5258 will help win a return to propriety and force the reintroduction of conscience and ethics into this business of defense purchasing. These are qualities that are sadly lacking in both Government and industry in our defense purchasing today.

Mr. Speaker, my files are full and bulging with cases such as the one I have described here today. I am developing more new cases daily, and I will be glad to turn them over to the proper committee when hearings begin on my two bills.

FAKE RUSSIA-CHINA RIFT?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the fanfare and ballyhoo has finally reached a climax. After years of planted stories and a careful buildup, the sham battle is on. Apparently American leadership is falling for this fake rift between Russia and China. Stories planted in the Communist Party mouthpiece Pravda and the Communist government-controlled Izvestiya, has suddenly become headline news throughout the United States and the free world.

The stage is set. The Chinese and Russian delegations are in Moscow. The scheme has been carefully concocted. At this psychological moment, when Khrushchev is putting on the greatest act of his life, Uncle Sam comes longingly and wistfully to Moscow seeking a test-ban agreement, possibly a nonaggression pact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, maybe joint space exploration, and deals concerning Cuba and Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, are we about to engage in another Yalta, another Tehran, or another Potsdam with more secret con-

cessions in which the Communist agreements are not worth 2 cents—agreements which are just scraps of paper to buy time or with which to deceive? Another Yalta will finish the United States and the free world and will assure the perpetual ascendancy of communism. Those who know the elemental facts of communism know that there is no such thing as a Chinese Communist or Russian Communist or a Cuban Communist. They are all world Communists sworn to conquer and dominate the world for the party—the Communist world party. Any argument between Communist Russia and Communist China or between Communist Russia and Communist Yugoslavia is either a sham or only a disagreement as to when to bury the United States. It is extremely dangerous for the United States to make any agreements or commitments or to sign anything with Red Russia predicated upon a phony rift between Russia and China.

The trail of Communist Russia and Communist China is marked with broken promises, lies, murder, deception, and fraud. Basic Communist dogma calls for proclamations of peace, agreements, treaties, and negotiations all to be broken if it advances the cause of world communism. They will take two steps forward and one backward. Red China's attack on India last fall is a classic example. Russia's policy in Cuba is another.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind this House of the smiles of Khrushchev when he came to this Capitol, of his congeniality with the business groups, farmers, and his smiles to the children and women of America and his constant references to peace. Then, if I were an artist or cartoonist, I would like to paint for you the hard ruthless lines of his face as he took off his shoes and beat on his desk at the United Nations, screaming insults. Then I would draw for you the sinister recklessness of his bearing as he sat beside the glowering Malinovsky in Paris insulting the President of the United States and terminating the President's planned visit to Russia. This "Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" is now smiling again. The papers report that he is in a jovial mood and that Mikoyan is in a gala mood—yes, Mr. Speaker, the mood of the snake as he charms the victim.

I earnestly hope our leaders will enter into no agreement with this gangster, with this perpetrator of crime and murder, this racist who liquidated whole races of people. This rendezvous with Khrushchev could become a rendezvous with disaster, with liquidation and with slavery for the American people.

INTEREST RATES AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's move by the Federal Reserve Board to increase by five-tenths of 1 percent the interest rate in our Nation to slow the

outflow of short-term capital was, in my judgment, a grave mistake. The Board has in effect asked the people of the United States to board an elephant for the employment of a mouse. The grave disparity between the cost of this move and the result we might hope to achieve is alarming. One must remember that an increase in interest rates affects our domestic financing equally as much as it affects our international financing.

According to the Washington Post editorial of this morning, last year's short-term capital outflow amounted to \$507 million. In order to control, or seek to control this sum, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are asking the American consumer and taxpayer to carry this staggering burden. Consumer installment credit will amount to over \$60 billion this year. This is a cost of \$30 million in additional interest cost to the consumers. A substantial amount of the Federal debt will have to be originally financed or refinanced in this coming year. Since a substantial amount of our present debt is carried under short-term bills, at least \$100 billion will have to be financed or refinanced on the new interest rates and this could cost another \$50 million. On any commitments from the taxpayer and consumer over and above this consideration, it should be remembered that State, county, city, and district debt now amounts to well over \$200 billion, and a substantial amount of this debt will be turned over in short-term obligations in the near future and it also will have to carry the added burden of a five-tenths of 1 percent. I am suggesting that the total cost for this rise could well reach the staggering sum of \$100 million.

No one has suggested that any conditions intimating inflation exist in our present economy. Quite to the contrary, we are worried about increasing the activity, expansion, and growth of that economy. This move made by the Federal Reserve Board is calculated to go in the opposite direction of the policies being proposed by the administration and suggested by most responsible economists.

To my knowledge no one is suggesting that there is any unequitable squeeze on the money-lending segments of our economy. As a matter of fact and figures, exemplified in the June 1963 Economic Indicators prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, in the last 10 years while the gross national income was increasing approximately 50 percent, interest income increased over a 100 percent. Finally, I agree 100 percent with a statement out of, again, the Washington Post editorial of today:

The "firming of interest rates" may at best slow the outflow of short-term capital, but the movement of short-term funds is not a principal problem.

That there is some confusion in the Federal Reserve Board position is also indicated by their release to the Associated Press on July 15 which I previously quoted in Tuesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which I here requote for emphasis:

There is no systematic relationships between interest rates on the availability of credit in the United States and the flow of

money overseas, a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded Wednesday.

Evidence regarding the question of whether international capital and gold flows tend to be interest induced is becoming more abundant and more confusing, the survey found, which leads us to again conclude that we are apt to be boarding an elephant and working a mouse, and it might be a sick mouse at that.

AMERICAN FARM LABORERS DO NOT CHOOSE TO "STOOP"; DOMESTIC LABORERS SCORN JOBS EAGERLY SOUGHT BY MEXICANS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a letter of July 9, 1963, from the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California. This letter should have been read by every Member of Congress before voting on the Mexican labor bracero bill. I ask of my colleagues, who voted to throw out the bracero program, these questions: Are they prepared to finance a staggering welfare "handout" to domestic farm families? How will they explain to the homemaker the soaring cost of fresh produce? Can they make an American farm laborer want to harvest "stoop" crops—such as lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions, brussels sprouts, radishes, cauliflower, beans, sugar beets and strawberries? Why toss aside the best foreign-aid program we have yet devised? The Mexican farmworker comes eagerly to earn American dollars. When the crops are picked, he returns to his homeland and family, richer and happier. Here is American money which is earned and goes directly to the little people—the people no other assistance reaches. Is this program taking work from our own farm laborers? It is not. By law every farmer is required to employ domestic help when it is available. The bracero program is strictly controlled by the U.S. Department of Labor. I ask of my colleagues—who loses? All transportation carriers and countless allied industries—fertilizer, insecticide, and farm machinery producers and distributors; seed, oil and freezer companies, canneries, and so forth. Again, I ask—who loses?

Mr. Speaker, every American stands to lose as we cast aside the bracero program. The following letter expresses all this and more.

GROWER-SHIPPER
VEGETABLE ASSOCIATION
OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA,
Salinas, Calif., July 9, 1963.

HON. MINOR C. MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The failure of Congress to extend Public Law 78 came as a great surprise and shock to the California vegetable industry which will not be able to produce

vegetables without a supplemental supply of agricultural workers. Vegetable production requires workers to stoop, and over the years we have attempted to recruit domestic workers from Texas and other areas, and although we were able to recruit some workers most of them only continued to work a few days or a few weeks.

Vegetable and berry production in the central coastal area of California is practically a year-round operation. We commence harvesting in April and are harvesting in large quantities from the first of May until the first of December. This area ships approximately 60,000 carloads of fresh vegetables throughout the Nation. Our major vegetable crops are lettuce, celery, carrots, broccoli, onions—dry and green, tomatoes, artichokes, Brussels sprouts, cauliflower, green and dry beans, sugarbeets and strawberries. Ninety percent of the fresh vegetables and berries are shipped out of the State and are distributed throughout the country for consumption.

We grow and ship from 20 to 45 percent of the Nation's supply for several of these commodities.

At the peak of our harvesting season, May and September, we have historically used approximately 12,000 supplemental workers. From March 20 until January 1, we use a minimum of 2,000 to 3,000. For the last 2 years the Department of Labor would not certify for supplemental workers for the months of January and February and it has been necessary for some of our growers to reduce their acreage during the winter months. We have recruited several thousand domestic workers from the San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Joaquin areas. These workers have proved quite unsatisfactory as they only worked a few hours to a few days and left.

If the growers are able to continue their historic production it will be necessary to recruit domestic agricultural workers. It is doubtful if there are available workers willing to go into agricultural production in numbers up to 12,000. Many of these people, of course, would be family people and we would be required to furnish suitable housing for families which we presently do not have to accommodate in such large numbers. Because of the vagaries of agriculture, we would not be able to afford them a continuity of employment as agricultural crop production does not permit continuous employment. Were we placed in a position to have to depend on domestic agricultural workers recruited from areas throughout the country, the cost would be prohibitive in that thousands of them may mentally think they can do the work but would not be able or care to do the work required. Obviously the welfare problem would be of staggering proportions. In the past we used workers from the British West Indies in small numbers and found that they would not do the stoop labor type of work. Domestic workers are satisfactory in cotton, tomato picking and in harvesting deciduous tree crops. However, they will not work in row crops requiring continuous stooping.

Prior to 1943 when the bracero program was first inaugurated, California had around 15,000 Filipinos and approximately 20,000 to 25,000 Japanese. In addition to these workers there were estimated to be over 100,000 Mexican "wetbacks." The central coastal area of California relied principally on the Filipino and Japanese workers. However, when the Philippines declared their independence, large numbers of the Filipinos returned to the Philippines and most of the remainder have gone into the service industries.

The Japanese were removed during World War II and very few have returned to agriculture and of those who have, most of them are growers in their own right.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's, the Immigration Service increased their vigil-

ance in preventing "wetback" Mexicans from coming into the United States. The growers who used the bracero program agreed with the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor that they would discontinue using "wetback" Mexicans and use only the legal bracero. Therefore, there are practically no "wetbacks" in California at the present time.

The bracero program has been very advantageous to the domestic workers as the Department of Labor and the State employment agencies would only permit the use of supplemental workers when their services determined that there were not sufficient domestic workers available to do the tasks required. The domestic workers had a right to any job a bracero had at any time. Whenever the Department of Labor or the State employment agencies found there were sufficient domestic agricultural workers, growers were required to release the braceros and repatriate them. The bracero program helped to minimize the welfare problem in California and other States requiring stoop labor.

Many industries depend and rely on agriculture—freezers, canneries, fertilizers, seeds, insecticides, farm machinery, oil companies, automobile and truck agencies, etc. The elimination of the bracero program will force growers to reduce their production considerably which in turn will throw many domestic workers in allied industries out of employment.

Agriculture in the central coastal areas of California grosses several hundred million dollars a year. At least 50 percent of this gross represents payrolls and obviously if these payrolls are curtailed or reduced, professional and business people in the agricultural communities of the State are going to suffer because of their curtailed business, so that the effect of the loss of the supplemental labor program will not only affect agriculturists, but will affect every segment of economic life.

I am enclosing herewith a chart which we compiled based on referrals from the California Department of Employment. This chart indicates the lack of desire of domestics to work in our type of stoop labor activity. And, if we were to have this type of experience from domestics that would be recruited from other areas of the United States, it would be practically impossible to carry on our present production schedules.

The vegetable growers of California must be assured of supplemental labor if they are to continue producing the fresh vegetables in the quantities they have been producing. These vegetables are distributed throughout the United States. For the sake of the general economy of California we urge you to consider extending the bracero program.

If California growers are going to be required to do without a supplemental labor program, the small grower is going to have to consolidate with the larger operators or will eventually be forced out of business. California has always had a basic agricultural labor force, but at the present time its entire economy is based on the supplemental use of braceros. I do not wish to leave the impression that braceros are the only workers in agricultural fieldwork for there are estimated to be over 400,000 agricultural workers in California, the bracero is only used as a supplemental force when needed.

Sincerely yours,

JACK E. BIAS,
Executive Vice President.

MIGRANT FAMILIES OFTEN DOUBLE THE SIZE OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his

remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TALCOTT**. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress who voted against the bracero program may have failed to consider thoroughly some of the hardships which will be imposed unnecessarily upon our rural communities.

Gilroy, Calif., is not in my district but their predicament is not untypical; as a Member of Congress, I feel some responsibility for them.

The population is about 7,800. For a few months during harvest, 2,500 supplemental laborers are required in the area. If these laborers are accompanied by their families at least 10,000 people must invade Gilroy. This means that all schools would have to be more than doubled in size, facilities, teachers. Does any Member know a community in the world which can afford to double its school system for a few months of the year.

History is clear that jails need to be more than doubled. Can any community afford to more than double its capacity of expensive facilities such as jails, hospitals, and so forth for a few months of the year.

Families must be housed in family-type dwellings. Not even the Federal Government in a most spendthrift fit of largesse could afford to build, maintain, and operate minimum family-type housing with only 2, 3, or 5 months occupancy expectancy. A migrant system for providing supplemental farm labor would require these fantastically enormous and wasteful expenditures for Gilroy and all other agricultural communities in California. Does any Member of Congress honestly advocate this?

A community and industry may afford housing, feeding, and public facilities for men without families—whether they are domestic migrants or foreign—for short periods. The farmer, employee and the community would prefer the domestic, if he is available. When a domestic is not available, labor must be imported to complete the harvest.

Is there any Member of Congress who honestly intended to impose upon Gilroy an influx of people twice its size. Most other small agricultural communities in California face the same problem. The bracero program was a decent, effective, economic and humane solution to this enormous problem of every agricultural town in California.

We need your understanding and help desperately.

HISTORY OF DEALS WITH COMMUNISTS SHOULD SERVE TO WARN US

Mr. **SIBAL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. **ALGER**] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALGER**. Mr. Speaker, as the Kennedy administration prepares to make another deal with Khrushchev, perhaps it is not amiss to remind the Members of Congress and the American people what happened when President Roosevelt tried the same thing.

The results of Yalta and Teheran sent millions of people into Communist slavery and helped to advance the Soviet Union into a world power which now threatens freedom everywhere. Yet, President Kennedy, refusing to heed the lessons of history, is evidently preparing to follow exactly the same course with Khrushchev that Franklin Roosevelt took with Stalin.

The following column by Dr. Robert Morris, "Will 1963 Be 1943 Repeated?" is an apt lesson in history; I hope it will be read carefully and that enough people will be awakened in time to prevent further deals with the Communists.

WILL 1963 BE 1943 REPEATED?

(By Robert Morris)

History has a way of repeating itself. But for some reason men seem destined not to comprehend this elemental fact. Perhaps the solution lies in man's supreme confidence that he can do things better than his predecessors before him.

The late Forest Davis, a great reporter, was chosen by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to do a semi-official report on the Teheran conference in December 1943. The President spent 2 hours describing his policy to Forest and then personally made changes in the finished account.

This read:

"To the President, an ingrained optimist who believes in the efficacy of cross-the-table confabulation, the fact that he and Stalin were face to face was at least half his battle. It marked, as he saw it, a long step forward in the accomplishment of his 'great design' for a peaceable, lawabiding world."

It was at Teheran that the President most clearly exhibited his tough minded determination to enroll the Soviet Union as a sincere and willing collaborator in postwar settlements. That determination, I am able to say, is at the center of his "great design."

In the interest of his objective, Mr. Roosevelt has avoided the slightest cause of offense to the Kremlin. The core of his policy has been the reassurance of Stalin. That was so, as we have seen, at Teheran. It has been so throughout the difficult diplomacy since Stalingrad. Our failure to renew our offer of good offices in the Russo-Polish controversies must be read in that light. Likewise our support, seconding Britain, of Tito, the Croatian Communist partisan leader in Yugoslavia. So it is also with the President's immediate and generous response to Stalin's demand for a share in the surrendered Italian fleet or its equivalent. Our bluntly reiterated advice to the Finns to quit the war at once without reference to Soviet terms falls under the same tactical heading.

Mr. Roosevelt, gambling for stakes as enormous as any statesman ever played for, has been betting that the Soviet Union needs peace and is willing to pay for it by collaborating with the West.

The late President mapped out the following four points in order to win over Stalin:

(1) To give Stalin without stint or limit everything he asked for the prosecution of war, and to refrain from asking Stalin for anything in return.

(2) To persuade Stalin to adhere to statements of general aims, like the Atlantic Charter.

(3) To let Stalin know that the influence of the White House was being used to en-

courage American public opinion to take a favorable view of the Soviet Government.

(4) To meet Stalin face to face and persuade him into an acceptance of Christian ways and democratic principles.

It is now 1963. The whole rationale of our policy today is basically a repetition of Roosevelt's "grand design."

We now know that Roosevelt's grand design was a colossal failure. Hundreds of millions of humans went into bondage as a result of Roosevelt's gamble.

This time however, the stakes are higher. It is no longer Poland, Yugoslavia, or Eastern Europe that are being pushed onto the gambling table. It is our National Defense Establishment, our sovereignty and our way of life itself.

I notice that Khrushchev just the other day in one of his reported ideological differences with the Red Chinese, reaffirmed his loyalty to Leninism. It was Lenin who said: "It was necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth."

There is no evidence whatever to support the conclusion that Soviet power is mellowing or that Soviet nature is changing.

Will 1963 be 1943 all over again?

Mr. Speaker, reviewing the four points President Roosevelt used 20 years ago in a futile effort to appease the Communist dictator Stalin, is it not logical for us to conjecture what points President Kennedy is using for the same approach to Stalin's successor, Khrushchev? The whole story is so ridiculous it should be treated with laughter, but the results of the policy are so tragic we can do nothing but fear the outcome of any treaty negotiated now with Khrushchev by Averell Harriman who, you remember, also played an important part in Roosevelt's negotiations with Stalin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. **SIBAL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. **BARRY**] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BARRY**. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Captive Nations Week each year will continue as long as 100 million people remain under ruthless Soviet Communist subjugation in Eastern and Central Europe. We will not forget these people.

They live behind the Iron Curtain, not because they gave up their struggles for independence, but because the Soviet red army never left the countries through which it marched westward at the end of World War II.

In fact, there are many undeniable indications that these unfortunate men and women are even continuing their struggle to gain their freedom. One example is the 20 divisions of the Soviet army and the wall through the center of Berlin that are needed to maintain Herr Ulbricht's East German regime.

Through the observance of this week we are able to bring to the attention of the peoples of the rest of the world the true nature of Communist imperialism.

Two dozen captive nations now feel the ruthless force of their Soviet rulers. They have seen their sons shipped off to

prison camps in Siberia. They have seen their churches closed and their cultures suppressed.

Yet, their hope still remains—hope that one day they will be free to live as individual human beings and not as cogs in the wheel of an all-pervading state. America has carried on a continual effort to help these people. We will not stop until they are free. If proclamation of Captive Nations Week annoys the Soviet leadership—as may be seen by their constant angry statements concerning it—then I can only say to them, "Let these people go free."

The purpose of Captive Nations Week will have been fulfilled when the need to proclaim it no longer exists.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, appointed by the Speaker of the House shortly after I became a Member of Congress this year, it is gratifying to note the excellent progress which has been made toward realization of a National Cultural Center here in our Nation's Capital.

I am told that when the Congress made possible this center through its generous donation of land and legislative action in the 85th Congress there were many who doubted that the center would ever come to fruition.

There were, and still are, many obstacles to the center's realization. For one thing, many great communities throughout the land are simultaneously building their own local centers. Competition in fund-raising is, therefore, keen. Secondly, the Nation's Capital does not have the broad industrial base from which many sizable corporate contributions can be solicited.

Notwithstanding these and other difficulties, the Board of Trustees of the center has proceeded in a vast nationwide fund-raising program which has achieved important results to date. I believe that the trustees and all those responsible for the collection of funds here in Washington, D.C., and in the 50 States should be commended for the important progress which they have made.

Further, I believe that since Congress originally approved this project it should now follow through by enacting legislation extending the necessary time period in which the fund collection may be completed if all efforts and funds expended to date are not to be wasted.

Mr. Richard L. Coe, drama editor, points out the need for extension of time most succinctly and effectively in the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 14:

TIME NOW TOP NEED OF CENTER

(By Richard L. Coe)

Before New York's Lincoln Center even started to think about plans and fund-raising,

the Rockefeller brothers contributed \$5 million as an operating fund.

When, after years of pleading—and you can go back to the 1870's for early murmurings—Congress created the National Cultural Center, there was not 1 red cent as an operating fund.

This is the basic fact to be kept in mind about the Center. Sometime in September, Congress must extend its 5-year limit on the Potomac site set aside for the center.

Center officials do not anticipate congressional failure to do this because, with absolutely no operating fund to start with, decisive progress has been made.

Contributions have come in at an increasing rate over the past 5 years, though only in the past year has the organization felt equipped to get its drive out of low gear. Last week's news that the Government of Italy has offered to give all the marble Architect Edward Durrell Stone's building will require was an immensely powerful boost. Then there is the pronounced success of RCA's recordings of the service bands as a source of income.

To L. Corrin Strong, the board's first executive vice chairman, goes the outspoken appreciation of Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's board of trustees:

"Mr. Strong's contribution of overhead expenses for 2 years solved a vitally and usually unremarked problem in getting the ball rolling. Because we had no Rockefeller brothers to pay the bills as we got going, the first few years were based on nothing except good will and determination."

One hopes that in considering the legislation to extend the ground-breaking period, Congress will grasp this essentially unique characteristic: the pump had to be primed and it has been.

No clearer picture of the uniqueness of such an enterprise can be given than in the fascinating story of our city told by Constance McLaughlin Green in her Pulitzer Prize history "Washington: Village and Capital, 1800-1878." Here, in absolutely eerie detail, is a record like that of no other city.

Schooling, public health, sanitation, and road building, efforts to create a commercial or at the least a trading city have all required the most devious plotting, scheming and false starts. Originally two cities and a county, created from two States, Washington's existence always has depended on the whims of Congress. Never has a city had so exasperating a history.

This background must always be kept in mind as we consider the steps and progress of the National Cultural Center. It is a story never understood by outsiders and seldom grasped by unthinking residents. The problem of the center is essentially simple: stages, auditoriums, and theaters, never wholly adequate as Mrs. Green's references indicate, now have all but disappeared. To nourish the performing arts of past, present and future, the center is needed. Purely objective research reports done in the past decade are unanimous about this.

Now the point to keep in mind is that despite a long history of disappointments, stretching back decades, a considered plan is closer to fruition than at any other time. Chairman Stevens, having devoted the better part of 2 years to fund-raising, stated last week that "the money thus far raised or promised is closer to 15 than to 10 million and, by the end of the year 20 million may be in sight."

This could not have been said 1 year ago. Yes, progress has been slow but no one aware that there was not a cent to start with can expect more rapid achievement. Meeting with his executive committee here last week, Stevens confided reasons for optimism. Not long ago he had remarked: "I have developed something of a death wish in the whole effort."

Long contemplated, the Italian gift, which President Kennedy announced from Rome,

is immensely provocative, recalling Haiti's gift of wood to the American Stratford in Connecticut, the U.S. Government's indirect gift of Congress Hall to West Berlin, the American tax moneys which rebuilt the Viennese and other European operas and the American private citizens who reconstructed the burned theater at England's Stratford.

In view of history, tradition and present accomplishments, it is inconceivable that Congress will not overwhelmingly, proudly support the simple, inexpensive gift of time.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans across the Nation are conducting the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week. This observance comes at a very opportune time when too many of our citizens are waxing the illusion that the Russian-Red Chinese split will mean better times internationally for the United States; when too many of our people mistakenly believe that the consummation of a limited nuclear test ban treaty will produce a real relaxation of international tensions, indeed, of the cold war itself. Captive Nations Week is a sobering exercise of mind and spirit that causes us to face up to the realities of close to a billion people held in basic Soviet Russian captivity and of Moscow's and Peiping's cold war pursuits in the free world.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

We, in the Congress, have an excellent opportunity to reinforce this sobering exercise by moving in this session to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I take this occasion to call for the formation of this committee so that the realities of the vast captive world may be before the eyes of our people the whole year round, rather than just in 1 week. The serious troubles and problems confronting the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists today are the paramount result of a whole decade of discontent, uprisings, and revolution on the part of the captive nations in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, and Asia. This is no time to help Khrushchev and his minions in their troubles by playing down the captive nations and the powerful surge of patriotic nationalism they represent. On the contrary, this is the time to concentrate more than ever before on this fundamental matter of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, there are many unfortunate examples, both present and past, that can be cited as conclusive evidence of the pressing need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Secretary of State Rusk's letter on Georgia, Armenia, and Ukraine is, as we know, a classic in official misconception and misunderstanding of numerous captive nations. But in connection with Captive Nations Week let me cite another outstanding example.

Many observers cannot forget the Nixon example during the period of the first Captive Nations Week observance in 1959. Since the former Vice President has recently elected to speak on the goals of extending freedom and the like, I believe we should take a look at his record concerning Khrushchev and the Captive Nations Week resolution. In this bipartisan effort, I do this solely for purposes of constructive criticism and the most earnest hope that we may avoid such experiences in the future; no personal criticism is at all intended.

Based on Nixon's own testimony, it is a record that scarcely does credit to our past and present official understanding of the captive nations. In a documented analysis of the Nixon story, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and the author of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, states:

As his book on "Six Crises" attests, he still doesn't understand what happened when Khrushchev unleashed his attack against the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

Because a careful study of this analysis, which appears as an article titled "Nixon and the Captive Nations Resolution" in the authoritative journal, the Ukrainian Quarterly, spring 1963 issue, will enable us to appreciate further the need for a special committee, I request that it be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

MOSCOW SEEKS U.S. ACQUIESCENCE TO ITS EMPIRE

From 1959 to the present, Khrushchev and his propaganda machine have aimed above all at the crystallization of official U.S. acquiescence to Moscow's enormous empire. This is the implication of his latest proposal for a Warsaw Pact-NATO nonaggression treaty; this has been the steady implication of his deceptive peaceful coexistence gestures. In this we must never give in; and the best guarantee that we will not can be provided by our creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer, in its July 15 issue, raises the pertinent question "Khrushchev, What Now?" The editorial bears on Captive Nations Week and shows that the basic, causal reasons underlying the cold war will still be ever present regardless of a test ban treaty or a Sino-Russian chasm. I ask that this illuminating editorial be printed in the Record following the Dobriansky analysis.

On this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, originally made possible by the 86th Congress, I raise the question "Members of Congress, What Now?" And the answer which most of us share is a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. We, the people's representatives, have the opportunity to keep Khrushchev and his tyrannical minions on the defensive as concerns the all-important, the most fundamental matter in the cold war—the two dozen and more captive nations.

The analysis and editorial follow:

NIXON AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION (By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Conflicting stories about former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and the Captive Na-

tions Week resolution will undoubtedly be told for many years to come. Since 1959, when the Vice President made his famous tour to the Soviet Union, numerous versions of his negative attitude toward the resolution have been given. In the 1960 presidential campaign, for example, Senator J. W. Fulbright demanded the release of the official text of the Nixon-Khrushchev conversations on the historic resolution which Congress had passed in July 1959. It was rumored then that the disclosure would have been devastating to Nixon. Many wonder today why this text hasn't been disclosed.

Another example is the account offered in 1962 by the columnist Drew Pearson. On the basis of his interview with the Russian dictator, Pearson maintains that Nixon "actually apologized to Khrushchev for the action of the American Congress."¹ The questionable story Pearson related goes as follows:

"Naturally I knew about the resolution," Khrushchev said, "but did not plan to mention it since Nixon was our guest. However, much to my surprise Nixon mentioned it himself and said that Congress was foolish to have passed the resolution."

"Do you mean to say that Members of Congress are fools?" Khrushchev said he asked Nixon.

"Oh, this is just a private conversation between us," Nixon said quickly.

One cannot but suspect the validity of this story when it is recalled that even before Nixon's plane landed in Moscow, Khrushchev had already brought up the resolution. In a stadium rally at the time he bellowed and railed against the resolution and its sponsors. However, part of Pearson's story appears quite plausible. As far as I know, Nixon has never denied his apologizing to Khrushchev for the passage of the resolution. And it is this point that continually emerges in the many different stories.

THE NIXON STORY

For an American to gage the damage that was done in Moscow it isn't at all necessary to depend on these many shifting stories of Nixon's behavior. Nixon's own qualified account is sufficient for this purpose. Whether the former Vice President has realized it or not, his story is a portrait of self-indulgence.

Richard Nixon didn't know what struck him when he arrived in Moscow for the American Cultural Exhibition in July 1959. As his book on "Six Crises" attests, he still doesn't understand what happened when Khrushchev unleashed his attack against the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

It is not, of course, my desire or intention to indulge in personalities or to cast any ill-light on their motivations. That unconstructive course never makes for objective discourse. I have the highest esteem for Mr. Nixon as I do for all public servants who have duties to perform and responsibilities to discharge in behalf of our national interest. I single out Nixon not because of Nixon but rather because of his direct official involvement in and his subsequent testimony to an event which continues to bewilder most Americans. Nixon's errors, omissions, and deficiencies may be viewed as a particular personification of the trained capacity for such behavior as demonstrated by the Kennans, the Bohlen, and other well known Russian experts. As Nixon himself tells us, he was briefed extensively by such experts in the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other Government bodies. What's more, his heavy entourage to Moscow consisted of top-level advisers.

¹ Pearson, Drew, "Faked Photos in Golden State," The Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1962, p. D11.

The chapter on Khrushchev in Nixon's book demonstrates clearly the limitations and flaws in the understanding of too many of our leaders with regard to the Soviet Union and the nature of the threat facing us. The concepts and conceptions shown by Nixon reveal only too plainly some of the reasons why the United States has been losing the cold war since World War II. Throughout the book Nixon is under the illusion that the Soviet Union is populated only by the Russian people. The main prison house of nations is nonexistent for him. He seems to gloat over the fact that he was given the opportunity to speak directly to the "Russian people," although he is thoroughly unaware of the additional fact that the several things he had to say couldn't but have had an adverse effect on the majority of non-Russian nationals in the U.S.S.R. Adding imprecision of thought to factual inaccuracy, if Nixon is not talking about the "Russian people," he is employing the equally misleading notion, "the Soviets."

As to ideology and reality, Nixon exudes similar confusion. He reveals to us that "the most important single purpose" of his mission was to convince Khrushchev "that he could not hope to convert the United States to communism."² This is a rather fantastic conception of the problem. The Soviet Russian totalitarians haven't converted any nation to "communism," including the entire Russian nation. So why place the United States as an unwary, lamb-like object of mythical conversion?

If, instead of concentrating on the myths of communism and conversion, Nixon had viewed the problem in its true light, he would have regarded as his most important single purpose the conveyance of our knowledge to Khrushchev about Soviet Russian imperial-colonialism and also our determination to beat it in its tracks. This could have been done diplomatically and with knowledgeable resolve. Khrushchev would have respected Nixon for it. For respect from the Russian bear is not obtained by falling prey to his disseminated myths.

THE MAJOR SOVIET RUSSIAN IRRITANT

When it comes to the "major Soviet irritant" throughout Nixon's tour, as he himself phrases it, the limitations and defects come into full bloom. The evidence provided by the participant himself, and reflecting the advice and judgments of countless others, clearly shows how unprepared and short we are in coping with the claws of the bear. By this evidence Nixon confirms the fact that he fared rather poorly and feebly when he was confronted by Khrushchev's explosion over the Captive Nations Week resolution. The reader will recall the passage of this measure by our Congress immediately prior to the Vice President's departure.

Consider carefully the evidence supplied in Nixon's book. He reports that upon his arrival Khrushchev "was lambasting the United States generally and me personally for the captive nations resolution" which, according to him, "called for prayers for those behind the Iron Curtain."³ He goes on to say how difficult it was for him to imagine "that the resolution truly disturbed the Soviet Premier because it was simply the expression of a well-known opinion in the United States, and not a call to action."

After reading this, one wonders whether Nixon himself had ever read the resolution. First, it should be pointed out that he had nothing whatever to do with its passage. If he was lambasted, it obviously wasn't personal but official. Second, the resolution does not explicitly call for prayers. It authorizes public observances which, in prac-

² Nixon, Richard M., "Six Crises," New York, 1962, p. 244.

³ Ibid., p. 247.

tice, include prayers in addition to numerous other activities. Moreover, the unique element in the resolution is its specific reference to the main prison house of nations and its inmates, namely, the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. It is this element that stunned Khrushchev, then and ever since. Contrary to Nixon's assertion, the emancipation of these nations is certainly not "a well-known opinion in the United States."

Finally, the whereas clauses leading up to and predating the resolve in Public Law 86-90 unquestionably constitute a call to action. It is action for a cold war strategy to be pursued until all the specified and other captive nations become free and independent. It is a form of action that Nixon himself called for in his acceptance speech before the Republican National Convention, but never concretely spelled out.⁴

By no means is this all. Another highlight in Nixon's testimony of American bewilderment is his "pure protocol courtesy visit" to Khrushchev. He gives a vivid account of how the Russian leader immediately lunged into the resolution.⁵ You can visualize the setting. Nixon tells us that the Russian jailer developed "a long harangue" and spoke in "a high-pitched voice," and frequently pounded the table.⁶ Khrushchev is quoted as saying that "the Soviet Government regarded the resolution as a very serious 'provocation.'" He is also quoted on its supposed negative effects upon the Geneva Conference, a peace treaty for Germany, and a "general improvement in relations between our two countries," as though the U.S.S.R. is a country in the national sense.

Khrushchev, according to this testimony, set the stage for all that was to follow during Nixon's tour. He couldn't understand why President Eisenhower issued a Captive Nations Week Proclamation if he wanted Nixon "to have a good reception" in Moscow's main prison house of nations. Furthermore, the Russian leader suspected a plot by the U.S. Congress. Evidently, for his conspiratorial mind all of this was too neatly timed. As to be expected, he warned that it would mean war if we intended to "change anything in the U.S.S.R. or in any other country." He then brought out the warped fiction on "how the Russian people had repulsed what he called U.S. intervention at the time of the birth of the Soviet regime, during 1919-21, and certainly would do so now."

NIXON AT A DISADVANTAGE

In the course of this first meeting how did the Vice President present our case? First, from his account, he was apparently misinformed on the time Congress passed the resolution. It was not passed on July 6—the day it passed the Senate—but on July 9. Second, Nixon again was taken aback by Khrushchev's fury over the resolution. He didn't expect him to bring it up during this "pure protocol courtesy visit." As he puts it, "I had to make a quick decision of how to react to his attack." He actually thought that Khrushchev "was going through an act—that he was using the resolution as a pretext for taking the offensive against me, and that had it not been for this resolution, he would have found some other excuse for doing so." Why so?

Regarding our question, Nixon offers no logical explanation as to why this would have been so. Nor could he. Eisenhower's Paris experience in 1960 doesn't at all apply to his. It is perfectly sound for one to hold that had there been no resolution in July 1959, the Vice President would have been wined, dined, and swayed by typical Russian cold-war hospitality. There is no reason to believe that a pretext was necessary at that time. Mos-

cow was at its peak in its deceptive peace offensive, and Khrushchev himself was planning to visit the United States. Thus, the pretext argument used by Nixon is more of a post-rationalization for an unexpected attack than anything else.

Worse still is Nixon's admission of the two points he emphasized to Khrushchev. One point is that the resolution "was a decision made by the Congress over which Eisenhower had no control." The other point reads, "The resolution did not call for our intervention, or even for our support of a revolution in the satellite nations." Here are perfect examples of how not to approach a Soviet Russian totalitarian, even in the rarified realm of diplomacy. It is hard to believe that Nixon had to grovel with such low apology by intimating that Congress was wrong in passing the resolution. Equally incredible is the further apologetic note about our intervention. Despite his many assertions about a cold-war offensive, this type of feeble behavior spells the complete defensive in the presence of the prime cold-war instigator.

Again by Nixon's testimony, Khrushchev opened himself wide for some pointed retorts. The fiction about U.S. intervention in 1919-21 was a topic which could have been chewed on with particular reference to the reestablishment of the Russian prison house of nations. The jailer's ears could have been pinned back on this one. Concerning the resolution itself, the tactic that was made to order by Khrushchev's numerous utterances and should have been seized upon by Nixon is one of stressing competitive ideals and ways of life. Why this awful fear of a congressional resolution? But such an offensive presupposes knowledgeability. As Marx said, the Russian bear will continue to claw the other defenseless animals.

To be sure, as Nixon attests, Khrushchev kept clawing in this first meeting. He shook his finger at the Vice President, he threatened that Nixon would hear about the resolution for the duration of his stay, he shouted and pounded, he dubbed the resolution, and then "he spelled out what he meant in some earthy four-letter words." Even Troyanovsky, his interpreter, had to blush "bright red." Still, at the close of this first meeting, Nixon was in the dark about all this. He completely misjudged the hospitable Moscow keeper and never understood the full import of the resolution.

Khrushchev also kept his word on Nixon hearing about the resolution during his tour. The frightened sought to frighten the innocent. To take a few instances, at the American exhibition in Sokolniki Park, where the superficial "kitchen debate" occurred, the Russian leader again denounced the resolution. He embraced a workman nearby and declared for all to hear, "Does this man look like a slave laborer?"⁷ While Nixon was concerned with irrelevancies, such as the comparative merits of "the Soviet system" and our economy, his political climb and Khrushchev's, the jailer was very much obsessed by the meaning of the resolution for his compound of imprisoned nations.

THE RUSSIAN JAILER POTEKINIZES

Later, at Khrushchev's dacha, the resolution came up again. The native Russian (Khrushchev isn't a Ukrainian nor is he, like Stalin, an adopted Russian) suggested a boat trip for the Vice President and his party "to see how the slaves live."⁸ The 2-hour trip turned into a trip about captives. Mikoyan according to Nixon, characterized it as "fine river rallies." On eight occasions Khrushchev ordered the boat to be stopped so that he could shake hands with the bathers in the Moskva River and ask them, "Are you captives? Are you slaves?"⁹ Naturally, the

shouted reply was *nyet, nyet*. Whereupon Khrushchev would turn to Nixon, rib him a bit or two, and shout "See how our slaves live." Nixon was informed later by Ambassador Thompson that the only bathers allowed to use the river are the elite of the new class.

The typical Potemkin village tactics of fraud and fear as shown here by Khrushchev are modes of Russian political behavior which we shall observe time and time again in other contexts. The Potemkin village characterization goes back to the time of Catherine the Great in the 18th century and is synonymous with false appearances. The sorry aspect of all this is Nixon's almost naive interpretations of the clawing he received from the bear. He rationalized that protocol had to be maintained, that Khrushchev was his host and the like. This is no excuse for not demonstrating, ever so politely and shrewdly, one's own knowledgeability about the U.S.S.R., its makeup, its unchangeable cracks.

When Nixon repeatedly speaks of the U.S.S.R. as a nation and groups the different national entities of this imperium into the mythical category of "Soviet people," the Russian totalitarian cannot but instantly scent his prey. When he regards Khrushchev as a "cold, hardheaded Marxist," the prime jailer cannot but recognize the solid effects of his smoke screening propaganda.¹⁰ And when he publicly testifies that he was bewildered by Khrushchev's reaction to the Captive Nations Week resolution, we have a fair measure of the validity as well as the gravity of Marx's wisdom about the Russian bear and its victims.

From the viewpoint of psychopolitical impact there were many other errors committed by the Vice President. At the request of Herbert Klein, who was Nixon's press secretary, I submitted a memorandum citing several of these errors. Nixon's exclusive concentration on Russia as against the non-Russian countries in the U.S.S.R., his mythical monolithic terms, such as "Soviet nation" and "Soviet people," his reference to Ukraine as the Texas of this "nation," his comparison of Novosibirsk, long the hub of slave labor in Moscow's empire, with our free western frontier towns, and his rags-to-riches attribution to Khrushchev's rise to power, which was actually accelerated by genocide and other crimes in the thirties and forties—these were some of the inexcusable errors pointed out.¹¹

We Americans might have contented ourselves with the superficialities of the "kitchen debate," but those in Moscow's primary empire who have long suffered the injustices and indignities of Soviet Russian domination over their homeland, must have been hurt deeply by the words and thoughts of America's second-ranking leader. Yes, the official text of the momentous Khrushchev-Nixon affair has yet to be released to the American public. As mentioned before, in the 1960 presidential campaign Senator FULBRIGHT urged its release when he accused the Vice President of expressing regrets to Khrushchev on the timing of the resolution.¹² Its release now should make for some interesting and instructive reading. After all, other texts on U.S. prestige abroad and other subjects have since been released.

The Nixon testimony of American bewilderment is only a meager parcel of the misunderstanding and misconceptions held in this country with regard to the Captive Nations Week Resolution. As emphasized earlier, Nixon simply gave high-level expression to this misunderstanding or lack of understanding. Innumerable examples can be

¹¹ Ibid., p. 274.

¹² Memorandum to the Vice President, Oct. 30, 1959.

¹³ "FULBRIGHT Cites Nixon Regrets," the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Oct. 19, 1960.

⁴ Ibid., p. 457.

⁵ Ibid., p. 250.

⁶ Ibid., p. 251.

⁷ Ibid., p. 252.

⁸ Ibid., p. 253.

⁹ Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 263.

cited from other spheres of our society. To mention one, in 1961 Stewart Alsop wrote an article in the Saturday Evening Post in which he stated: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."¹⁴

It's strange, to say the least, that this popular writer can compress into one sentence the admixture of truth, illogic and factual inaccuracy. It is a significant truth that Khrushchev has not ceased to denounce the resolution. He's been doing it since 1959. But logically, if this is so, then how could the resolution be deemed "innocuous"? And, in the realm of fact, Congress does not have to pass the resolution every year. Public Law 86-90 is on the books for an indefinite future. Moreover, the resolution, which was passed in a congressional off-year, was done so with far greater objectives than to attract minority votes. As a matter of fact, this consideration didn't even enter into it.

Evidently there's considerable room in this area for proper information and some education. The Nixon case is an excellent starting point for lessons to be learned. No area of our society is exempt in this regard.

KHRUSHCHEV, WHAT NOW?

The Moscow meeting of the Big Three Powers just as the disgruntled Chinese Communists seem to have brought themselves to admit they have been outgunned and outmaneuvered by their Soviet patrons in the Red intramural tug-of-war, is fraught with possibilities but no certainties whatever.

Our special negotiator, Averell Harriman, said before the talks that it would be several days before we could tell whether Nikita Khrushchev was serious—this time—about a nuclear testing ban, even the incomplete one now contemplated. Underground testing, with attendant inspection, still will remain for future haggling.

There is no doubt more than a grain of satisfaction for the West in the apparent fact that the Soviets did not yield to the Red Chinese demand for more belligerence, rigid Stalinism, and overt "exporting of revolutions." Coexistence, then, at least has a chance.

But there are many troubling factors still hanging fire—and needing settlement—before anything like a true "detente" between the Soviets and the West can take place. There are still thousands of Soviet troops in Cuba, where they have no business being. Germany remains divided, absolutely and completely at the insistence and by the power of the Soviets. Civil war still rages in Laos and divided Vietnam, where the Soviets had influence, whether or not they still do.

And this is Captive Nations Week, reminding us, if we need reminding, that the Duchy of Muscovy still holds unwonted sway over Armenia, the Ukraine, and many another so-called "SSR."

Khrushchev himself, in a new letter to Britain's egregious Bertrand Russell, has once more bluntly and specifically refused to pay any part of the United Nations' peacekeeping assessments, on the specious grounds that this would serve "the colonialists'" purposes. The only colonies enchaind since the Second World War—Hungary, Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, East Germany—go unmentioned, but not forgotten.

If Harriman can negotiate a partial test ban treaty which will at least spare the world the creeping horror of radioactive fallout, he will have accomplished much. If he can further open doors leading to sane

discussion of some of the other outstanding differences, fine.

It is impossible at this time to know if Khrushchev fancies he is using the West as a counterweapon against his mutinous ally, China, but it is entirely possible that for home as well as foreign reasons the Kremlin boss really is ready for a meaningful thaw in the cold war. While we decline to be used, we can ourselves make good use of such a thaw for the extension of freedom and world security.

There is little reason to trust Khrushchev, "hot line" or no, but the next voice we hear will have to be his.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this House heard commentary yesterday that the bracero program was and is defensible as a foreign aid program.

I submit that there is a clear doubt as to the foreign aid value of the bracero program. The Agency for International Development neither approves of nor disapproves of the bracero program.

This is clearly pointed out in a press release which AID put out on the evening of July 1. I should like to include this release at this point in the Record:

STATEMENT PHONED TO ASSOCIATED PRESS
JULY 1

The Agency for International Development states that it takes no position on the merits of the bracero program. The statement furnished to the House Foreign Affairs Committee noted that the program should continue only if it is of net benefit to both countries. AID expresses no opinion as to whether or not it is of sufficient advantage to each country to merit discontinuing or continuing the program.

In its testimony on the foreign aid bill, AID merely attempted to set forth certain facts on the bracero program: that it does benefit the Mexican economy by providing a source of dollars and helping the Mexican balance of payments. The termination of the bracero program would, of course, have an adverse effect upon the Mexican economy that would have to be taken into account in considering whether or not any foreign assistance should be rendered to that country. But the continuation of the bracero program itself, which involves many factors other than the dollar earning capacity of Mexico, cannot be judged on this basis alone, and AID expresses no opinion on this program.

THE NEXT 5 YEARS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we all so well know, it is vitally important that we in Congress all be aware of the recent technical and strategic developments in the area of defense. In the modern

world the United States faces a great challenge in this direction which demands an informed and prepared Nation.

A few days ago I referred you to the current issue of the General Electric Forum, which has selected as its topic "What's New in Defense?" Today I bring to your attention another excellent article from that magazine, "The Next 5 Years," an appraisal by our distinguished Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, on the world environment and its demand for defense contributions from the United States.

Here is the challenge and America's response as expressed by Secretary McNamara in congressional presentations and public statements on such issues as: the Communist design for world conquest; the free world response—including balance of strategic retaliatory and general purpose forces; research and development for an effective balance of military capability. The Secretary's statements have been compiled by the editors of the forum.

I strongly believe that those of us who are not members of the Armed Services Committee and have not had the opportunity to hear the Secretary's testimony directly can benefit from this article. It should, moreover, be read by all Americans. I am, therefore, inserting it at this point in the Record; and I recommend it in the highest possible terms to my colleagues and to all who read this Record.

Last year when our attention was focused particularly on the Berlin crisis, I pointed out that our defense program was geared to our global requirements over the long term, and not simply to the immediate situation. Since that time, the Nation, and indeed, the whole world has gone through another crisis, precipitated again by the Soviet Union, this time in Cuba. However, as acute as this crisis was—and the aftereffects have yet to be fully liquidated—it did not then and should not now distract our attention from the more fundamental and far-reaching challenge which communism poses to the free world.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO FREEDOM

The missiles in Cuba represented but a small part of the total Communist threat to freedom. Crises or probing actions all over the world—in Cuba, South Vietnam, India, Berlin, Africa—are simply more obvious manifestations of the Communist drive toward their basic objective of world domination.

In this regard, there has been no change in the policy of the Soviet Union to encourage what Mr. Khrushchev calls wars of national liberation or popular revolts—what we know as covert armed aggression, guerrilla warfare, and subversion. And the Soviet Union has not diminished its efforts through the more subtle means of economic and military aid, political intrigue, and propaganda to win over the neutral and emerging nations of the world to the cause of communism. From Africa to the Near East, from southeast Asia to Latin America, the pattern is the same.

LATIN AMERICA, AFRICA, THE NEAR EAST

In Latin America, as hunger and economic instability persist, the danger of communism will be ever present. Indeed, it is not an overt-armed Communist attack that is the real danger in this part of the world, or even Communist sabotage and subversion. The real danger lies in the discouragement, disillusionment, and despair of the people as

¹⁴ Alsop, Stewart, "The Berlin Crisis; Khrushchev's Weakness," the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

a result of the relatively slow rate of economic and social progress.

Africa is another area in which the Communists will try to take advantage of any political and economic instability. The real danger there is quite similar to that in Latin America—namely, that the Communists could gain a foothold by subverting and overthrowing an existing government. When we consider the large number of newly independent countries on that continent, the many opportunities for troublemaking become readily apparent.

In the Near East we face quite a different kind of situation. While most of the countries in this area are still politically unstable and economically underdeveloped, some are much further along in their efforts to modernize. In general, our interest in this area is to help create an environment in which each of the nations can maintain internal stability and develop in its own way without fear of attack from its neighbors or from the Communist bloc.

CHINA'S PRINCIPAL THREAT IN ASIA

The situation in south Asia is now reaching the critical point. After several years of nibbling at the northern borders of India, the Chinese Communists last October launched an attack in strength and seized large areas of Indian territory. The security and independence of India are matters of urgent concern to the entire free world. We have already made massive investments in that country's economic development to help the people of India and to demonstrate to the people of all underdeveloped nations that there is a straighter and smoother road to economic and social progress than communism. Now we must consider what is required to help defend the fruits of our mutual efforts.

In southeast Asia, the Communists have for the present foregone the use of open armed aggression in favor of the more covert techniques of subversion, insurgency, and guerrilla warfare—popular revolts. Although the principal arena of the struggle at the moment is South Vietnam, it could easily spread to neighborhood areas.

The principal threat in the Far East, as well as in south and southeast Asia, is Communist China, for the Soviet Union is unlikely to initiate a war in the Pacific alone. It may well be that the logistic effort involved in the Chinese Communist attack on India will detract from their ability to undertake military adventures elsewhere. But we know from experience that the pressure can be quickly shifted from India to southeast Asia, even to Japan or the Philippines; we must continue to help guard all these areas.

BASTION AGAINST COMMUNISM

European NATO, with a population of more than a third of a billion and a gross national product of well over \$350 billion a year, is still a principal bastion against the spread of communism. The six Common Market nations, plus the United Kingdom, by themselves have a total population, a military manpower pool, and a gross national product well in excess of that of the Soviet Union.

With the continued growth and extension of the Common Market, coupled with an increasing degree of political integration, in time there will inevitably develop in Europe a new power center, more nearly the equal of the Soviet Union and its European satellites. With the manpower, production capacity, and technical and scientific skills available to them, the nations of Europe should not only be able to provide larger contributions to their own defense, but should also be in a position to contribute more to the defense of freedom in other parts of the world.

In view of this growing strength, some basic changes in our present arrangements with our NATO partners would be very much

in order. We have no desire to dominate NATO. In fact we would be very happy to share more equitably the heavy burdens we now carry in the collective defense of the free world. But as long as we do carry so great a share of the total burden, we cannot escape a proportionately large share of responsibility for leadership and direction.

The most critical problem at issue between East and West in Europe continues to be the fate of Berlin. Our sharp confrontation of the Soviets in the Caribbean no doubt upset their agenda for Berlin. Their stationing of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in Cuba was directly related to that agenda. The psychological if not the military threat that these missiles would have posed to our own homeland was apparently the trump card which Mr. Khrushchev intended to play in the next round of negotiations on the status of Berlin.

THE SOVIET UNION

Although Communist China is the more reckless and belligerent of the two, the Soviet Union has by far the greater capability to cause us injury or otherwise damage the interests of the free world. There is no gainsaying that Soviet resources, industry, and technology have given that country the potential to challenge the primacy of U.S. military power in the world.

While the size, variety, and power of our strategic retaliatory forces still greatly exceed those of the Soviets, the Kremlin leaders have at their command the resources, production capacity, and technology to produce strong forces of their own. We believe they will continue to make great efforts to do so. The Soviet Union can also be expected to maintain large and well-equipped conventional forces to insure the internal security of the Soviet Union, to control its European satellites, to secure its Eastern frontiers and to threaten Western Europe.

In addition, we cannot preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union might seek to establish a direct military presence in other parts of the world, as they did in Cuba. But we believe that they are well aware of the dangers inherent in a direct confrontation between United States and Soviet military power in these areas where we hold a distinct military advantage.

Accordingly, we may anticipate that the Soviet Union will concentrate primarily on other means to extend its influence in these areas, including opportunistic political support, economic aid and military assistance to nonaligned countries, and covert assistance to dissident elements in countries allied with the Western Powers.

COMMUNIST CHINA

Notwithstanding the attack on India, the economic prospects of the Communist Chinese are extremely bleak and will, at least during the next few years, serve to limit the size and character of their military adventures. Mainland China is essentially an agricultural economy, and when agriculture suffers, the entire economy suffers. The disastrous consequences of Communist China's agricultural policies are now clear for all to see. The masters of Peking are having difficulty feeding their people, even at a bare subsistence level, and have had to resort to very large-scale procurements of foodstuffs from abroad.

SUMMING UP

To sum up, the Soviet Union will most likely pursue a strategy in which their military forces are designed to permit the Soviet Union to:

(a) Confront us with continuing political pressure, subversion, and various forms of unconventional warfare under the umbrella of their growing nuclear power.

(b) Capitalize on their conventional military power by the threat of bringing it to bear in situations where they have local conventional superiority.

(c) Deter the West from military action. Communist China will most likely follow an independent policy designed to expand its own influence in the Communist camp and among the unaligned nations, resorting to armed aggression to satisfy its ambitions only where this can be done without a direct confrontation of U.S. military forces.

U.S. RESPONSE

Our response to the Communist threat cannot be a simple one. The Soviet decision to concentrate on wars of covert aggression was not taken in a power vacuum. It rests on the fact of U.S. nuclear power, which is able to survive a nuclear surprise attack and strike back with sufficient power to destroy the enemy target system. But our superior nuclear power may not be a credible deterrent for the kind of conflict proposed by Khrushchev.

That power is essential to our strategy and tactics—indeed to our survival as a nation. But it is equally clear that we require a wider range of practical alternatives to meet the kind of military challenges that Khrushchev has announced he has in store for us. A nonnuclear buildup will increase our capacity to tailor our responses to a particular military challenge to that level of force which is both appropriate to the issue involved and militarily favorable to our side.

Nuclear and nonnuclear power complement each other—in our own military forces and within the NATO alliance—just as together they complement the nonmilitary instruments of policy. Either without the other is, overall, not fully effective. Our policy is aimed at achieving the best balance of military capabilities over the entire range of potential conflict, in the various areas of the globe where the free world has vital interests, and over the years as far ahead as we can reasonably plan. I firmly believe that the nonnuclear buildup will—by improving and expanding the alternatives open to the free world—reduce the pressures to make concessions in the face of Soviet threats.

As we develop a balanced, modern, nonnuclear force, ready to move rapidly against aggression in any part of the world, we continue to inhibit the opportunities for successful conduct of Khrushchev's local wars.

But we shall have to deal with these wars of liberation—often not wars at all. In these conflicts, the force of world communism operates in the twilight zone between political subversion and quasi-military action. Their political tactics are terror, exhortation, and assassination. We must help the people of threatened nations to resist these tactics. You cannot carry out a land reform program if the local peasant leaders are being systematically murdered.

THE COMMUNIST GUERRILLA THREAT

To deal with the Communist guerrilla threat requires some shift in our military thinking—combating guerrilla warfare demands more in ingenuity than in money or manpower. We have been used to developing big weapons and mounting large forces. Here we must work with companies, squads, and individual soldiers, rather than with battalions and divisions. In all four services, we are training fighters who can in turn, teach the people of free nations how to fight for their freedom. At the same time that our strategic weapons are becoming more and more sophisticated, we must learn to simplify our tactical weapons so that they can be used and maintained by men who have never seen a machine more complicated than a well sweep.

The measures we propose to improve our limited war capabilities follow a number of well-defined lines. Our overall purpose here, as in our strategic buildup, is to augment our forces in a balanced fashion. We have increased the number of combat-ready divisions to meet the military contingencies

with which we may have to deal. As we have increased manpower, we have modernized and expanded weapons procurement. We have increased our tactical air power to match our ground forces, and we have launched a program to provide sea and airlift tailored to the man and equipment.

EMPHASIS ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Research and development expenditures, whether measured in budget terms or in program terms, have been mounting steadily over the years. But too much of this effort is not producing useful results. What we want are weapons and equipment that the fighting man can use. If we are to make optimum use of our available scientific and engineering manpower resources, we must plan our program carefully and concentrate these resources where they will make the greatest contributions to our military posture.

Poor planning, unrealistic schedules, unnecessary design changes, and enormous cost increases over original estimates have continuously disrupted the efficient operation of our research and development program. Most of these difficulties have resulted from inadequate prior planning and unwarranted haste in undertaking large-scale development. We have often paid too little attention to how a proposed weapon system would be used, what it would cost, and whether the contribution the development could make to our forces would be worth the cost.

Accordingly, we are now inaugurating large system-development projects only after the completion of what we call a program definition phase. We want to do our thinking and planning before we start bending metal. Pencils and paper, and even the feasibility of pacing components are much cheaper than the termination of programs.

This is a general rule—one referring to developments which, if successful, would add only marginally to our combat strength. There have been and are exceptions—developments which can add a new and unique dimension to our capability, such as the A- and H-bomb developments and the ICBM. When the potential payoff is extremely great, correspondingly great costs and risks are justified. But developments which meet this test are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways, usually the more extensive or imaginative use of existing weapons. In such cases, the urgency is not as great. We believe that the substantial increase in the defense program initiated during the last 2 years has put us in a position where we can now afford to move more carefully in initiating new major weapon system developments.

THE MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Because the space effort is very costly, accounting for more than 20 percent of our total 1964 research and development program, and because we attach great importance to rapid progress along this new technological frontier, we consider it essential that the Defense Department space program meet two fundamental criteria.

First, it must mesh with the efforts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in all vital areas. Second, projects supported by the Defense Department must promise, insofar as possible, to enhance our military power and effectiveness. Space technology is new and its implications, especially for the military mission, cannot be fully known or foreseen at this time. It is these very uncertainties about the character and importance of space undertakings for military purposes that have led us to give such emphasis to space in the defense program.

PRESERVING FREE WORLD SECURITY

The security provided by military strength is a necessary but not a sufficient condition

for the achievement of our foreign policy goals, including our goals in the field of arms control and disarmament.

We are approaching an era when it will become increasingly improbable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategic nuclear forces, either by surprise or otherwise, to preclude a devastating retaliatory blow.

Military security provides a base on which we can build free world strength through the economic advances and political reforms which are the object of the President's programs, such as the Alliance for Progress and the trade expansion legislation. Only in a peaceful world can we give full scope to the individual potential, which is for us the ultimate value.

A distinguished European—Andre Malraux, French Minister of State for Cultural Affairs and an eminent novelist and critic—visited the United States last year as a guest of the President. Malraux paid a moving tribute to our Nation when he said: "The only nation that has waged war but not worshipped it, that has won the greatest power in the world but not sought it, that has wrought the greatest weapon of death but has not wished to wield it. May it inspire men with dreams worthy of its action."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, on Monday, July 22.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, on July 18.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 2 hours, on Thursday next, vacating his order for 1 hour on the same day.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. SIBAL), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, July 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. WINSTON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIBAL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATTHEWS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. WAGGONER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 628. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1512. An act to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1627. An act to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision

and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 546. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for the use of lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, Calif., for a nuclear electric generating station.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JULY 16, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	General counsel	\$9,442.50
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	9,442.50
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	9,442.50
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	8,615.04
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	5,058.18
Betty M. Prezioso	do	5,058.18
Peggy Jean Lamm	do	4,711.50
Martha S. Hannah	do	4,711.50
Jane C. Wojcik	do	4,169.70
Lee Smith	Staff assistant (Jan. 1-3)	44.21
Carolyn Becker	Staff assistant (from Mar. 1)	2,057.48
Thomas J. Kraeft	Clerk (from June 14)	240.31
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel	4,494.78
George Missbeck	Printing editor	5,361.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963..... 11,185.13

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963..... 11,185.13

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963. 13,814.87

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director	\$9,442.50
Paul M. Wilson	do	9,442.50
Carlson W. Culp	Staff assistant	9,367.26
Robert M. Moyer	do	9,179.22
Jay B. Howe	do	9,179.22
Ross P. Pope	do	9,179.22
Frank P. Sanders	do	9,179.22
G. Homer Skarin	do	9,179.22
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	9,179.22
Robert L. Michaels	do	9,179.22
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,708.86
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	7,674.84
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	7,392.78
Francis G. Merrill	do	6,891.29
Earl C. Slisby	do	6,734.58
Samuel R. Preston	do	5,775.30
Keith F. Mainland	do	5,253.24
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,928.16
George A. Urian	Clerk-stenographer	4,169.70
Stephen B. Miller	do	4,169.70
James E. Moore	do	4,169.70
Austin G. Smith	do	3,627.96
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,580.59
Mabel E. Hammett	Clerk-stenographer	3,627.96
Grace W. Beirne	do	4,169.70
Patrick M. Hayes	do	4,169.70
Janice Newsom	do	2,084.85
William J. Neary	do	3,302.94
Harry E. Reynolds	do	4,169.70
Mary L. Schwarzmann	do	4,169.70
Mary H. Smallwood	do	4,169.70
Jeanne C. Smith	do	4,169.70
Suzanne S. Thomas	do	1,651.47
Phyllis N. Troy	do	3,953.04
Mary F. Wilson	do	3,411.24
John A. Ringwald	do	1,813.98
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	8,615.04
Agnes Anillian	Clerk-stenographer	3,801.96
James H. Bersie	do	3,429.34
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	4,169.70
Alice Beach	do	3,844.68
Josephine Birdsall	do	4,169.70
Jesseamine A. Falls	do	4,169.70
Catherine L. Kennett	do	3,627.96
Clara B. Posey	do	4,169.70
Paul D. Quinn	do	1,100.98
Virginia E. Stevens	do	514.37
Dorothy E. Sweeney	do	46.33
Daniel W. Fessler	do	1,696.28
Geoffrey L. Nichols	do	3,023.30

Amount of expenditures previously reported. \$254,587.09
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963. 254,886.22

Total amount expended from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963. 509,473.31

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

played by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William B. Soyars, Jr.	Director, surveys and investigations staff, to May 1, 1963.	\$5,232.52
Leonard M. Walters	Director, surveys, and investigations staff.	7,804.90
Rowland C. Halstead	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	7,298.70
Leo E. Conroy	do	2,688.34
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,772.44
William T. Roy	Consultant	2,000.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agriculture, Department of:		
Dorick, Stanley J.	Investigator	\$3,047.59
Wright, Ralph C.	do	8,960.32
Air Force, Department of:		
Tuomey, J. C.	do	2,118.48
Brown, Robert M.	do	4,006.08
Army Audit Agency:		
Lowcher, A. T.	do	3,419.05
Wagner, K. G.	do	756.90
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Burke, John J.	do	914.46
Bureau of the Budget:		
Fallick, Lawrence	do	4,337.67
Civil Service Commission:		
Beecher, Richard S.	do	5,596.19
Coltrin, Marion J.	do	2,317.97
Commerce, Department of:		
Steiwig, Nathan	do	4,527.99
Corps of Engineers:		
Crossman, C. C.	do	1,074.40
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, C. L.	do	3,372.08
Bronstad, T. A.	do	1,271.44
Carlson, W. D.	do	7,131.12
Conroy, L. E.	do	5,008.64
Franklin, R. M.	do	6,592.32
Garrett, C. F.	do	4,536.96
Geiermann, F. H.	do	1,640.16
Greal, F. P.	do	1,216.16
Hagan, P. V.	do	2,060.32
Health benefits fund:		
Hoeker, A. E.	Investigator	643.25
Hutchinson, L. S.	do	2,045.92
Kaack, M. R.	do	4,098.80
Laphear, B. L.	do	2,819.28
Law, W. C.	do	6,769.92
Leen, M. P.	do	5,008.96
Life insurance fund:		
Lueders, L. M.	Investigator	714.56
McDowell, L. L.	do	336.65
McGahey, H. B.	do	1,689.12
Magee, E. H.	do	6,769.92
Murphy, P. J.	do	4,522.56
Neafsey, E. J.	do	6,025.52
O'Brien, A. R.	do	6,408.72
Reproduction of staff exhibits		1,561.36
Retirement fund:		1,259.52
Roberts, R. S.	Investigator	47.25
Shannon, A. J.	do	6,685.09
Smith, M. A.	Stenographer	3,358.72
Turner, P. A.	Investigator	3,648.48
Vahey, E. W.	do	3,023.76
Watkins, H. D.	do	4,919.92
Wood, H. B.	do	5,030.48
Federal Communications Commission:		
Evans, John	Investigator	3,814.32
Stant, A. E.	do	3,648.48
General Services Administration:		
Donohue, Leomon P.	do	4,445.27
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Booher, Curtis O.	do	5,077.67
Walker, Virgil R.	do	6,336.02

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—CON.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Interior, Department of:		
Babb, A. G.	Investigator	\$8,010.30
Petersen, James M.	Editorial assistant	2,070.61
Labor, Department of:		
Harbaugh, T. M.	Investigator	6,902.89
National Bureau of Standards:		
Gautier, William K.	do	4,553.00
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Rachlin, H. H.	do	3,007.28
National Institutes of Health:		
Cassidy, T. J.	do	2,521.60
Navy, Department of:		
Rosen, Emanuel	do	39.98
Wilkenloh, C. E.	do	3,721.23
Post Office Department:		
Larson, W. D.	do	4,515.36
Small Business Administration:		
Harvith, A. J.	do	7,427.84
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Johnson, J. M.	do	5,077.59
Kvaven, Sven	do	1,212.92
Veterans' Administration:		
Kosinski, A. L.	do	2,562.37
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		41,858.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures. \$638,108.16

Amount of expenditures previously reported. 326,756.95

Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963. 311,351.21

Total amount expended from July 1, 1962 to June 30, 1963. 638,108.16

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

* Includes amount to be transferred pursuant to authority in legislative branch appropriation bill, 1964.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	\$9,442.50
John R. Blandford	Counsel	9,414.30
Philip W. Kelleher	do	9,414.30
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	9,414.30
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary	5,335.50
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	5,004.06
L. Louise Ellis	do	5,004.06
Edna E. Johnson	do	4,568.84
Dorothy R. Britton	do	4,711.50
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,795.90

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 84 AND 146, 88TH CONG.)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel (from Feb. 1)	\$7,335.95
Walton Woods	Investigator (from Feb. 1)	6,329.10
Phyllis Seymour	Secretary (from Feb. 1)	3,565.05
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,418.34
Sam A. Nunn, Jr.	Assistant counsel (to Feb. 28)	1,244.92
Barbara M. Tippet	Secretary (from Apr. 8)	1,572.96
Jane Wheelahan	Secretary (to Mar. 15)	1,479.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 4, to June 30, 1963	25,227.80
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, to June 30, 1963	25,227.80
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963	49,772.20

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JULY 2, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John E. Barriere	Professional staff member	\$9,442.50
Marguerite Bean	Assistant clerk	6,452.52
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,424.32
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member	9,442.50
Harrison F. Houghton	Senior economist (EOD, Jan. 4, 1963)	9,285.12
William Summers Johnson	Clerk and staff director (EOD, Feb. 1, 1963)	7,868.75
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority	5,568.42
Robert R. Poston	General counsel	9,442.50
Elizabeth L. Ruth	Secretary	5,004.06
Baron I. Shacklette	Chief of research (EOD, Jan. 31, 1963, resigned, Feb. 28, 1963)	1,416.37

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 228, INVESTIGATING STAFF

Gary Wayne Bach	Messenger (EOD Apr. 1, 1963, resigned May 31, 1963)	\$646.60
Karl Brunner	Economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963)	782.25
Paul W. Cootner	Senior economist (EOD May 28, 1963, resigned May 28, 1963)	52.46
John M. Culbertson	Professional staff member (EOD May 26, 1963)	1,836.04
Gerard Haase-Dubosc	Assistant clerk (EOD June 17, 1963)	155.59
Helen E. Hayden	Assistant clerk (EOD Mar. 12, 1963)	2,272.40

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 228, INVESTIGATING STAFF—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George C. Hill	Assistant clerk (EOD Mar. 25, 1963)	\$2,134.27
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member (EOD May 1, 1963)	3,147.50
Donald P. Jacobs	Senior economist (EOD June 17, 1963, resigned June 29, 1963)	728.56
Eugene M. Lerner	Senior economist (EOD June 20, 1963)	577.04
Harvey C. Mansfield	Professional staff member (EOD June 26, 1963)	262.29
Thomas Mayer	Senior economist (EOD June 20, 1963)	577.04
David Meiselman	Senior economist (EOD May 20, 1963)	2,150.79
Allan H. Meltzer	Economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963)	836.46
Janet Faye Minesinger	Clerk-stenographer (EOD Mar. 1, 1963)	2,664.24
Lawrence B. McLeMORE	Messenger (EOD June 1, 1963)	400.60
Donald L. Robinson	Professional staff member (EOD Apr. 1, 1963)	2,125.50
Richard T. Selden	Senior economist (EOD May 24, 1963, resigned May 31, 1963)	367.21
Ira Oscar Scott	Senior economist (EOD May 19, 1963)	2,203.25
Regina Swanner	Assistant clerk (EOD May 9, 1963)	1,213.97
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk (EOD Apr. 1, 1963)	2,084.85

EMPLOYEE WHOSE SALARY IS REIMBURSABLE TO A GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Housing and Home Finance Agency: Arnold H. Diamond	Senior economist (EOD Apr. 1, 1963)	\$4,326.66
--	-------------------------------------	------------

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 204, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Frances Y. Burns	Secretary	\$3,736.32
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	8,826.60
Jean Cameron	Research assistant (EOD June 1, 1963)	785.00
Royal L. Coburn	Minority counsel (resigned Apr. 7, 1963)	4,759.00
Eleanor Hamilton	Research assistant	3,795.90
Casey Ireland	Minority member (EOD Apr. 8, 1963)	4,108.06
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director	9,442.50
Helen B. O'Bannon	Research assistant (resigned Feb. 28, 1963)	1,156.64
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	6,584.16
John R. Stark	Professional staff member (EOD Mar. 11, 1963)	5,500.33
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,608.54

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$280,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	92,847.71
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	92,847.71
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	187,152.29

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel (P)	\$8,615.04
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director (P)	7,016.64
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator (P)	6,358.50
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk (P)	6,452.52
James T. Clark	Clerk (C)	8,615.04
Ellen M. Coxeter	Assistant clerk (C)	4,500.18
Patricia Ann Dempsey	Assistant clerk (C)	3,210.84
Jennie H. Owings	Assistant clerk (C) (employed Feb. 1, 1963)	2,344.39
James M. Earnest, Jr.	Assistant clerk (C) (resigned June 30, 1963)	2,587.80
John G. Sims	Assistant clerk (C) (employed June 1, 1963)	263.11
Total		49,964.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	2,335.56
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963	2,335.56
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	22,664.44

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.

¹ Appropriated under H. Res. 202.

² Spent for clerk hire on RLA investigation.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Chief clerk	\$9,442.50
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	9,442.50
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,442.50
Richard T. Burrell	Minority clerk	9,430.36
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,845.07
Charles Radcliffe	Minority counsel, education	3,501.27
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant	4,548.96
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,538.08
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,548.96
Donald F. Berens	do	4,548.96
Marvin R. Fuller	Chief, investigative task force	3,934.37
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management	3,672.08

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Olive Gibbons.....	Secretary.....	\$356.76
Total.....		73,261.37

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... None
 Amount expended from January 3 to June 30, 1963..... \$73,261.37

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee staff:		
Alfredo Vidal.....	Assistant investigator.....	\$1,694.40
Olive M. Gibbons.....	Secretary.....	1,730.29
Corrine A. Huff.....	Receptionist.....	2,730.94
Cleomine B. Lewis.....	Administrative assistant.....	3,019.14
Mary L. Shuler.....	Secretary.....	1,840.77
Michael Schwartz.....	Assistant clerk.....	213.65
E. Zeld McNeal.....	Secretary.....	1,016.77
Waldo E. Parrish.....	Administrative assistant.....	1,186.61
Jeanne E. Thomson.....	do.....	1,693.22
Manuel Casiano.....	Investigator.....	401.98
Ruben Ortiz.....	do.....	401.98
Beverly Pearson.....	Minority secretary.....	3,946.66
Total.....		19,876.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures for salaries Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 19,876.41
 Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 1,171.56

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 21,047.97

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 28,952.03

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education, No. 1 (Chairman, Representative CARL D. PERKINS):		
Hartwell D. Reed.....	Counsel.....	\$7,893.61
Freda Tuttle.....	Secretary.....	3,157.33
Earl McCoy.....	Assistant clerk.....	326.84
Cornett.....		
Total.....		11,377.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963, for salaries..... 11,377.78

Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 3.30

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 11,381.08

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 13,618.92

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 2		
Jay H. Foreman.....	Assistant counsel.....	\$2,749.12
Adrienne Fields.....	Clerk.....	3,349.63
Edmund D. Edelman.....	Counsel.....	3,879.91
Total.....		9,978.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

For salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 9,978.66

Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 328.75

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 10,307.41

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 14,692.59

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 3

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William T. O'Hara.....	Counsel.....	\$5,000.54
Betty R. Pryor.....	Clerk.....	6,033.75
Total.....		11,034.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 11,034.29

Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 350.66

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 11,404.95

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 13,595.05

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 4		
Robert E. McCord.....	Clerk.....	\$7,130.86
Mary E. Corbin.....	Secretary.....	3,684.73
Cleveland Bush.....	Assistant clerk.....	100.77
Elizabeth Meyer.....	do.....	390.69
Lelia W. Throup.....	do.....	415.32
Total.....		11,722.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 11,722.37

Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 4.60

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963..... 11,726.97

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 13,273.03

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION NO. 5

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John C. Muntone	Counsel	\$3,200.64
Rosaline M. Manley	Secretary	1,569.24
Barbara L. Rugito	do	1,411.89
Kassian A. Kovalcheck, Jr.	Assistant clerk	328.37
Total		6,510.14
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		6,510.14
Amount expended for other expenses, from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		6.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		6,517.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963		18,482.96

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR NO. 6

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Curtis C. Aller	Director	\$2,667.98
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,070.28
Total		3,738.26
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures for salaries, Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		3,738.26
Amount expended for other expenses from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		433.72
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963		4,171.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963		20,828.02

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	\$9,442.50
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant	9,334.38
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	9,334.38
Franklin J. Schupp	do	9,249.72
Robert F. Brandt	Investigator-consultant	9,099.29
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant	8,887.74
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	7,674.84
Marian A. Czarnecki	Staff consultant	8,863.38
Melvin O. Benson	Staff consultant (From Mar. 11, 1963)	4,905.99
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	7,491.48
Helen C. Mattias	Staff assistant	6,424.32
Helen L. Hashagen	do	6,287.94
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	6,189.24
Mary Medsker	do	4,085.76
Doris B. McCracken	do	5,909.70
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,213.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$117,500.00
Amount expended from January 1 to June 30, 1963	40,335.22

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963 77,164.78 |

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963:	
Full committee	\$780.37
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	38,374.56
Military Operations Subcommittee	40,445.44
Government Activities Subcommittee	18,750.82
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	43,705.98
National Resources and Power Subcommittee	35,087.08
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee	42,956.39
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	21,357.04
Total	241,457.68

Salaries, full committee, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	9,442.50
James A. Lanigan, general counsel	9,442.50
Miles Q. Romney, associate general counsel	7,594.92
Earle J. Wade, staff member	6,734.58
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,754.82
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	4,700.64
Patricia Maheux, staff member	4,533.59
Charlotte C. Bickett, staff member	4,047.81
Malcolm K. Edwards, minority professional staff member (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	7,669.08
John Philip Carlson, minority counsel	7,919.28
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member (Jan. 1-2, 1963)	95.72
Expenses, Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963:	
Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery, supplies, etc., Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963, total	780.37

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	8,735.01
Arthur Perlman, investigator	7,468.34
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member (June 1-30, 1963)	891.79
Sally Lee Benditt, research assistant (Jan. 29 to June 30, 1963)	4,015.19
Veronica B. Johnson, clerk	4,206.76
Irene D. Manning, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Domingo E. Ulibarri, clerical staff	1,920.20
Ray Ward, staff member (Jan. 4 to Feb. 28, 1963)	2,876.98

Executive and Legislative, etc.—Con. Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst (Jan. 4 to May 31, 1963)	\$3,936.22
Expenses	117.31
Total	38,374.56

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator	9,285.12
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	6,067.62
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney	5,480.75
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,739.53
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Expenses	6,458.90
Total	40,445.44

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:	
Ernest Cornish Baynard, counsel	7,278.77
Daniel L. Power, investigator	4,212.16
Irma Reel, clerk	3,999.02
Lynne Higginbotham, clerk-stenographer (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	2,971.53
Expenses	289.34
Total	18,750.82

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel	8,147.90
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	8,147.90
Herbert B. Warburton, minority counsel	7,787.29
George O. Serin, investigator	6,317.25
William Donald Gray, research analyst	4,739.53
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	4,206.76
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	3,993.71
Expenses	365.64
Total	43,705.98

National Resources and Power Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman:	
Phineas Indritz, counsel	8,471.46
Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	7,209.45
Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst (June 1-30, 1963)	803.31
Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member (Jan. 4 to May 31, 1963)	4,369.77
Maurice B. Tobin, assistant counsel (June 1-30, 1963)	750.03
George L. Milestead, investigator (Apr. 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,626.62
Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer	4,206.76
Susan Mann, clerk-typist (Apr. 15 to June 30, 1963)	1,056.02
David Glick, assistant counsel (Jan. 4 to Apr. 30, 1963)	5,385.90
Expenses	207.76
Total	35,087.08

Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. E. MOSS, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	8,471.46
Vincent J. Augliere, chief adviser (Apr. 22 to June 30, 1963)	3,163.67
Jack Matteson, chief investigator (Jan. 3 to June 30, 1963)	7,403.61
David Glick, assistant counsel (May 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,373.37
Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel	3,936.64
William E. Barnaby, Jr., research assistant (Apr. 1 to June 30, 1963)	2,000.88
Helen K. Beasley, stenographer	4,206.76
Marguerite A. Gleason, clerk-stenographer	3,567.49
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel (Jan. 4 to Apr. 30, 1963)	3,928.28
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel (Jan. 3-31, 1963)	1,369.38
Walton Woods, investigator (Jan. 4-31, 1963)	1,139.24
Phyllis M. Seymour, clerk (Jan. 4-31, 1963)	641.71
Expenses	753.90
Total	42,956.39

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL, chairman:	
M. Joseph Matan, staff administrator	7,362.02
Charles Rothenberg, counsel	6,807.24
Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff	3,794.59
Millicent Y. Myers, stenographer	3,247.89
Expenses	143.30
Total	21,357.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	600,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963	241,457.68
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963	358,542.32

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$9,442.50
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	8,144.94
Mary F. Stolle	do	4,169.70
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		326.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963		326.35
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963		326.35
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963		4,673.65

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland	Professional staff director and engineering consultant	\$9,194.89
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel and consultant on national parks	8,865.79
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs	8,865.79
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands	8,865.79
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	7,925.54
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	4,526.36
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	4,314.20
Patricia B. Freeman	do	4,021.64
Patricia Ann Murray	Clerk (from Feb. 1, 1963)	3,565.05
Susan A. Whitener	Clerk	3,772.40
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		8,596.92
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1963		8,596.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1963, to June 30, 1963		8,596.92
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963		21,403.08

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	\$9,442.48
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	7,834.66
Marcella Fencil	Assistant clerk	4,895.68
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,640.55
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	4,115.54
Mildred H. Lang	do	4,115.54
Mary Ryan	do	4,115.54
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,898.84
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant (from Mar. 1)	2,743.68
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (from Mar. 1) (minority)	5,561.60
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	9,442.48
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	9,442.48
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist (to May 10, deceased)	6,802.70
Martin W. Cunningham	Aviation consultant (to Jan. 31, retired)	1,573.75
George W. Perry	Professional staff member (from Feb. 1, vice M. Cunningham)	7,453.45
James M. Menger, Jr.	Professional staff member (from June 1, vice Sam G. Spal)	1,490.69
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 17 and H. Res. 226:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	4,765.65
Margaret J. Robinson	Staff assistant (to Jan. 31)	1,390.40
Marion M. Burson	Staff assistant (Feb. 1 to 28)	1,390.40
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant (to Feb. 28)	1,371.84
Kathleen Theresa Crowe	Clerical assistant (from June 24)	90.51
William T. Denman III	Staff assistant (from June 17)	466.76
Rosalie Ann Peterson	Minority clerical assistant (from June 1)	458.39
Carolyn Sue Browning	do	550.49
Happy Pierce	Messenger (to June 30)	387.96
Frank C. Ryburn	Staff assistant (to May 31)	5,001.00
Phillip Sikes	Messenger (to May 31)	387.96
Wallace L. Briscoe	Staff assistant	5,004.04
Thomas Duncan Wynne III	Messenger (to Mar. 31)	387.96
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.	Minority counsel (from Mar. 12)	5,736.65
Bruce L. Sage	Messenger (to Apr. 30)	387.96
Special subcommittee on Investigations:		
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	9,386.06
George W. Perry	Associate counsel (to Jan. 31)	1,279.14
Robert E. L. Richardson	Associate counsel	5,551.62
Herman Clay Beasley	Subcommittee clerk	7,759.44
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,629.17
Rex Sparger	Special assistant (to May 31)	5,353.50
Zelig Robinson	Staff attorney (from June 1)	1,000.20
Mary E. Bainbridge	Stenographer-clerk (from Mar. 1)	2,527.00
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	3,898.84

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special subcommittee on Investigations—Con.		
Betty J. Lantrip	Stenographer-clerk (to Feb. 28)	\$1,263.50
Catherine C. McLees	Clerical assistant	4,115.54
Thomas D. Conway	Special counsel (to Mar. 31)	4,693.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$245,950.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963.....86,379.95

Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1963.....86,379.95

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963.....159,570.05

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 15, 1963.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	\$9,442.50
William R. Foley	General counsel	9,442.50
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	9,442.50
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	9,099.30
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	9,099.30
Garnet J. Cline	Assistant counsel	6,828.60
William H. Copenhagen	do	5,889.06
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	4,422.54
Anne J. Berger	do	6,201.80
Jane C. Caldwell	do	4,675.38
Frances F. Christy	do	5,568.42
Mary DeMatties	Clerical staff (from Jan. 15, 1963)	4,045.25
Velma Smedley	Clerical staff	5,775.30

SALARIES PAID JAN. 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, 86TH CONG.

Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	\$7,824.29
Beland, Lorraine W.	Clerical staff	4,015.01
Benn, Donald G.	Assistant counsel (as of Apr. 1, 1963)	3,028.80
Burak, Gertrude C.	Clerical staff	4,846.02
Cors, Allan D.	Deputy associate counsel	4,338.95
Cuddy, Karen M.	Clerical staff	3,131.13
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	do	4,100.21
Haardt, Alma B.	do	3,195.51
Hall, Patricia J.	do	3,263.82
Hunter, Edwin K.	Clerical staff (as of June 10, 1963)	206.17
Hyman, Joseph	Counsel	8,420.66
Jett, R. Frederick	Assistant counsel	7,362.02
Kelemonick, Michael	Clerical staff	3,780.60
Lee, Charles R.	Messenger	2,502.01
Levy, Joseph M.	Clerical staff	5,261.56
McCabe, Mary Wass	do	3,263.82
McGrady, Florence	do	3,567.49
Marcus, Philip	Associate counsel	8,563.85
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	Clerical staff	4,100.21
Moler, George P.	Clerical staff (as of June 24, 1963)	47.34
Rosenman, Louis	Associate counsel	7,315.76

**SALARIES PAID JAN. 4 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963,
PURSUANT TO H. RES. 36, H. RES. 100, 88TH
CONG.—continued**

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sky, Theodore.....	Assistant counsel (through Apr. 8, 1963).	\$3,405.50
Zelenko, Benjamin L.....	Assistant counsel.....	5,679.05
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$200,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, through June 30, 1963.....		109,822.28
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963.....		90,177.72

**SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF
INTERSTATE COMMERCE—SALARIES PAID JAN. 4
THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H.
RES. 35, 88TH CONG.**

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth G. Ainsworth.....	Economist.....	\$5,790.91
Jerome W. Breslow.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,212.13
Astrid E. Gram.....	Clerical staff.....	3,263.82
Constance Greess.....	do.....	3,674.05
Martha G. Hammond.....	do.....	3,405.41
Esther C. Lane.....	do.....	3,060.98
Leland C. Lehman.....	Economist Jan. 4, through Feb. 15, 1963.....	1,436.48
Julia M. May.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,423.65
Robert F. Melville.....	Senior economist.....	7,366.62
Anthony Partridge.....	Counsel.....	7,366.62
Norman M. Pharr.....	Clerical staff.....	2,914.30
David A. Sutherland.....	Counsel.....	7,366.62
Joel S. Wachs.....	Clerical staff (June 17 through June 30, 1963).....	186.95
Anne Waggoner.....	Clerical staff.....	3,263.82
Jerome M. Zeifman.....	Counsel.....	5,790.91
Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures.....		\$113,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, 1963 through June 30, 1963.....		64,072.59
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963.....		48,927.41

**FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES
CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND RE-
VISION OF THE LAWS**

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962.....	\$78,021.30
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963.....	22,294.32
Balance, June 30, 1963.....	55,726.98
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962.....	37,137.04
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963.....	14,259.99
Balance, June 30, 1963.....	22,877.05
C. Revision of the Laws 1963:	
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1962.....	10,416.71
Expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963.....	9,972.50
Balance, June 30, 1963.....	444.21

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

**COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND
FISHERIES**

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	Chief counsel.....	\$9,442.50
Bernard J. Zinke.....	Counsel.....	8,803.14
Ned P. Everett.....	Assistant counsel.....	6,903.84
W. B. Winfield.....	Chief clerk.....	9,000.54
Francis P. Still.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,382.30
Ruth A. Brookshire.....	do.....	4,278.06
Edith W. Gordon.....	Secretary.....	4,278.06
Vera A. Barker.....	do.....	4,278.06
E. M. Tollefson.....	Minority clerk.....	5,144.88
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$37,500.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963.....		8,813.71
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963.....		28,686.29

H. C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

**COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL
SERVICE**

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. Johnson.....	Staff director.....	\$9,442.50
George M. Moore.....	Counsel.....	9,442.50
B. Benton Bray.....	Professional staff member.....	8,709.09
John H. Martiny.....	Associate counsel.....	8,709.09
William A. Irvine.....	Staff member.....	8,427.02
Lillian L. Hopkins.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,775.30
John B. Price.....	do.....	4,819.83
Lucy K. Daley.....	do.....	4,819.83
Elise K. Thornton.....	Secretary.....	4,711.48
Blanche M. Simons.....	do.....	4,332.25
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$62,500.00
Amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30, 1963.....		24,201.15
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963.....		38,298.85

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers.....	Clerk, standing committee.....	\$7,204.68
Mary Spencer Forrest.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,253.24
D. E. Lukens.....	Minority clerk.....	4,928.16
T. K. Leachman.....	Messenger (June 17, to June 30, 1963).....	231.61

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Charles F. DuCanon.....	Executive director and chief counsel.....	\$9,442.50
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.....	Chief clerk.....	9,442.50
Philip B. Yeager.....	Counsel.....	9,442.50
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.....	do.....	8,738.40
Mary Ann Robert.....	Secretary.....	4,066.80
Emily Dodson.....	do.....	3,915.12
Carol F. Rogers.....	do.....	3,747.18
Patricia B. Harford.....	do.....	3,503.34
June C. Stafford.....	do.....	3,254.12
Investigations subcommittee:		
W. H. Boone.....	Technical consultant.....	8,563.38
Richard P. Hines.....	Staff consultant.....	8,295.36
Raymond Wilcoxe.....	Staff consultant (to Mar. 10, 1963).....	3,450.86
Joseph M. Felton.....	Assistant staff consultant.....	3,971.70
Katherine V. Flanagan.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,928.16
Dennis C. Quigley.....	Publications clerk.....	2,530.62
Mary Ann Temple.....	Secretary (to June 15, 1963).....	3,431.91
Elizabeth Ann Rothman.....	Clerical assistant (from June 17, 1963).....	140.89
Stephen A. Zorn.....	Assistant publications clerk (from June 17, 1963).....	140.89
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		47,689.15
Amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30.....		47,689.15
Total amount expended from Feb. 27 to June 30.....		47,689.15
Balance unexpended as of June 30.....		102,310.85

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person em-

ployed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	\$9,442.50
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	9,442.50
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	9,099.30
Ludwig J. Andolsek	Chief clerk (through Apr. 30, 1963)	6,295.00
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,734.58
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,074.84
Helen A. Thompson	do	6,348.32
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,568.42
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,819.86
Ester M. Saunders	Clerical assistant	3,312.86

STANDING COMMITTEE—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

James L. Oberstar	Subcommittee clerk	\$5,679.05
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	5,165.69
William B. Short, Jr.	do	5,165.69
Audrey G. Warren	Subcommittee clerk (as of Feb. 1, 1963)	4,377.70
Milton Weil	Staff assistant	5,763.07
Paul R. S. Yates	Minority staff assistant (as of Feb. 1, 1963)	5,001.00
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant	4,473.14
Agnes M. GaNum	Staff assistant	3,759.24
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant	3,460.94
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,635.23
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerical assistant	3,258.35
Dorothy Ann Carpenter	Research assistant (as of June 10, 1963)	315.18
James C. Healey, Jr.	Research assistant (June 1 to June 21, 1963)	291.80
Martin Baker	Research assistant (as of June 10, 1963)	210.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$110,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 50,647.77

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 50,647.77

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963 59,352.23

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	\$9,285.12
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	8,612.29
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	8,619.43
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	7,362.02
Robert A. McElligott	Associate counsel (through Mar. 15, 1963)	2,994.72
Salvatore D'Amico	Associate counsel	6,807.24
Patrick J. Cunningham	do	3,951.05
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant	7,868.01
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	8,200.85
John N. Dinsmore	Investigator	6,945.95
James P. Kelly	do	6,807.24
Sherman S. Willse	do	6,746.13
George E. Burgess	do	6,221.41
John P. O'Hara	do	6,221.41
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	do	5,576.19
Edward J. Gihooly	do	3,951.05
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	4,439.62
Harry A. Samberg	Research assistant (through Mar. 31, 1963)	2,070.37

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 236, 88TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Erwin Greenwald	Research assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1963)	\$2,141.76
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,825.54
Dolores K. Dougherty	do	3,708.35
Sylvia H. Reppert	Minority staff assistant	3,540.89
Sara L. Vollett	Staff assistant	3,208.14
Shirley R. Knighten	do	2,720.11
Anna S. Rosch	do	2,480.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$340,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 169,617.90

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 169,617.90

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963 170,382.71

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 237, 88TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk	\$6,899.70
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	8,947.64
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel	8,619.43
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	6,839.63
Roy Markon	do	6,423.57
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	4,744.84
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant	4,478.45
Florence C. Waters	Research assistant	4,212.13
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	3,354.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 56,585.34

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 56,585.34

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963 68,414.66

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	\$9,442.50
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	9,442.50

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff—Continued		
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (P)	\$7,822.15
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid (P)	6,922.62
George W. Fisher	Chief clerk (C)	9,442.50
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk (C)	5,521.92
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer (C)	4,603.14
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk (C)	4,603.14
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer (C)	3,953.04
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	7,190.58
Wilma Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	4,953.04
Kay N. Small	do	2,977.86
Mildred L. Blackwell	do	2,977.86
Mark S. Connell	Clerk-messenger	387.96
Stafford Hutchinson	do	271.57

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$60,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 22,640.57

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963 22,640.57

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963 37,359.43

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	\$9,442.50
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P)	9,442.50
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P)	9,273.24
John P. Baker	Professional assistant (P) (from Mar. 1, 1963)	5,016.28
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P) (to May 12, 1963)	6,800.38
Raymond F. Conkling	Professional assistant (P) (to Feb. 4, 1963)	1,677.91
Alfred R. McCauley	Professional assistant (P) (to Jan. 15, 1963)	735.95
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	3,882.60
Virginia Butler	do	5,031.12
William Byrd	do	2,571.54
Mary K. Daniel	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 3, 1963)	3,218.00
Frances E. Donovan	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 2, 1963)	54.70
Ann R. Fadeley	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 2, 1963)	36.88
William Goodrich	Staff assistant (C)	5,350.74
Olga Kay Greene	Staff assistant (C) (to Jan. 31, 1963)	713.01
Martha Sue Huitt	Staff assistant (C)	3,600.90
Grace Kagan	do	5,031.12
June Kendall	Staff assistant (C)	5,408.10
Elizabeth Price	Staff assistant (C) (from Feb. 1, 1963)	2,919.45
Dolores Rogers	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 7, 1963)	3,046.16
Gloria Shaver	Staff assistant (C) (from Jan. 3, 1964)	4,101.95
Eileen Sonnett	Staff assistant (C)	4,256.40

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Susan Taylor.....	Staff assistant (C).....	\$5,671.86
Irene Wade.....	Staff assistant (C).....	4,689.78
David West.....	Staff assistant (C).....	4,251.00
Hughson Greene.....	Document clerk (C).....	3,590.04
Walter Little.....	Document clerk (C).....	3,590.04
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$12,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963.....		824.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1963.....		824.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963.....		11,675.49

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appell, Donald T.....	Investigator.....	\$8,036.82
Joray, Juliette P.....	Recording clerk.....	6,076.44
McNamara, Francis J.....	Director.....	8,897.16
Nagel, Isabel B.....	Secretary to counsel.....	4,169.70
Purdy, Rosella A.....	Secretary to general counsel.....	5,014.86
Tavener, Frank S. Jr.....	General counsel.....	9,442.50
Turner, Anne D.....	Chief of reference and files.....	6,123.42
Veley, Lorraine N.....	Secretary to investigators.....	3,953.04
Watts, Vera.....	Secretary.....	3,671.28
Wheeler, William A.....	Investigator.....	7,580.82

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Arens, Margaret.....	Clerk-typist (appointed June 16, 1963).....	\$160.58
Baldwin, Beatrice P.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,869.49
Benedict, John R.....	Research analyst.....	4,819.86
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.....	Information analyst.....	2,880.29
Buglio, Theresa J.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,327.76
Burke, Gerard F.....	do.....	2,652.78
Butler, Daniel.....	do.....	2,652.78
Carlson, Charlotte B.....	Research analyst (resigned Mar. 31, 1963).....	1,854.60
Collins, Raymond T.....	Investigator.....	5,361.60
Courie, Kathleen.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	4,278.06
Cunningham, Annie.....	Information analyst.....	3,980.09
Curl, Jean W.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,210.84
Edinger, Elizabeth L.....	Editor.....	4,272.66
Edmondson, Carol A.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,142.84
Ellsweig, Rochelle.....	do.....	2,035.02
Fantozzi, Ettorina.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,221.08
Francis, Emily R.....	Information analyst.....	2,652.78
Gittings, Helen M.....	Research analyst.....	4,928.16
Goldblatt, Herbert.....	Clerk-typist (appointed June 10, 1963).....	224.82
Gredecky, Betty Ann.....	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Feb. 28, 1963).....	999.84
Holton, Katherine R.....	Research clerk.....	2,977.86
Huber, Walter.....	Consultant.....	7,674.84
Kelly, Maura Patricia.....	Research analyst.....	3,172.86
King, Olive M.....	Editor.....	4,765.68
Kocs, Evelyn M.....	Secretary to director.....	3,264.96
Margetich, William.....	Investigator.....	3,812.15
Muffley, David E. Jr.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,945.34
Muller, Jane S.....	Information analyst.....	3,194.58
Nittle, Alfred M.....	Counsel.....	7,491.48
Paff, Alma T.....	Editor.....	2,988.66

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Phillips, Katharine.....	Switchboard operator.....	\$2,734.08
Rainbolt, Doris S.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,409.00
Randolph, Josephins S.....	Research clerk.....	3,086.22
Rogers, Brenda R.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,945.34
Russell, Louis J.....	Investigator.....	5,264.48
Shaw, Doris P.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,891.16
Stiles, Lela Mae.....	Information analyst.....	3,237.89
Stoddard, Pamela Ann.....	Clerk-typist (appointed June 24, 1963).....	74.94
Stone, Gertrude F.....	Clerk-stenographer (from Mar. 1, through May 20, 1963).....	718.37
Sweany, Donald I.....	Research analyst.....	4,819.86
Vaccaro, Patience.....	Clerk-stenographer (appointed June 1, 1963).....	269.39
Valente, Mary Myers.....	Secretary.....	4,809.00
Wetterman, Neil E.....	Investigator.....	5,296.56
Wheeler, Billie.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,123.16
Yohe, John A.....	Staff member.....	5,889.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$360,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4, to July 1, 1963..... 152,134.90

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1963..... 207,865.10

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Chairman.
JULY 1, 1963.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 4, to July 1, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller.....	Counsel.....	\$7,408.22
Jane M. Deem.....	Administrative assistant.....	2,778.07
Myrtle Ruth Fouth.....	Clerk.....	2,344.53
Justinus Gould.....	Counsel.....	8,009.19
Helen C. Hitz.....	Secretary.....	3,684.73
Bryan H. Jacques.....	Staff director.....	5,724.44
Sylvia U. Keel.....	Secretary.....	3,684.73
Barbara Wright McConnell.....	do.....	4,372.91
Richard L. Mitchell.....	General counsel.....	9,211.14
Charles E. O'Connor.....	Counsel.....	5,022.52
Harry Olsher.....	Consultant.....	8,918.89
Gregg R. Potvin.....	Counsel.....	8,009.19
Audrey R. Smith.....	Research analyst.....	4,260.04
Penelope Walcott.....	Secretary.....	3,684.73
Ned L. Wernet.....	Research analyst.....	4,402.86
John J. Williams.....	Minority counsel.....	5,009.90
Jean H. Cameron.....	Secretary (terminated May 31, 1963).....	3,401.87
Linda Jackson.....	Secretary (appointed June 1, 1963).....	527.91
Temporary employees whose employment with the committee has expired:		
Katherine C. Blackburn.....	Research analyst (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).....	1,732.90
Jean W. Fender.....	Administrative assistant (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).....	1,891.10
Katherine F. Johnston.....	Secretary (terminated Feb. 11, 1963).....	763.62
Gertrude W. Jonson.....	Secretary (terminated Feb. 28, 1963).....	1,145.38
J. Brooks A. Robertson.....	Staff director (terminated Feb. 6, 1963).....	1,717.33

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Temporary employees, etc.—Continued		
Marie M. Stewart.....	Clerk (terminated Mar. 15, 1963).....	\$1,891.10
Marjorie Anne Carpenter.....	Secretary (employed approximately 6 weeks).....	763.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$275,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to July 1, 1963..... 105,398.77

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1963..... 169,601.23

JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1045. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ineffective maintenance and utilization of equipment furnished to Iran under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1046. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the second segment of the Report of the Special Study of Securities Markets, containing chapters V, VI, VII and VIII, pursuant to Public Law 87-196 (H. Doc. No. 95, pt. II); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1047. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1048. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Tenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to military air transportation, 1963 (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:
H.R. 7627. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and

employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 7628. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7629. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7630. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7631. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7632. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act to provide a definition of the term "age" as used in the labeling and advertising of whisky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (by request):

H.R. 7633. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 7634. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7635. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7636. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 7637. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7638. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Res. 443. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives with authority to report germane amendments to the Small Business Act, and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 444. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 103; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE: House Joint Resolution 63 of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois urging the Congress to enact the necessary amendments to the Federal Social Security Act or other Federal laws that may otherwise prevent the State of Illinois from acting to control excessive charges to public aid recipients, thereby contributing to the welfare of the recipients as well as reducing the increasing costs of public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of H.R. 2332, relating to paying pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7639. A bill for the relief of Silverio Conte, his wife Lucia Conte, their son, Aniello Conte and their daughter, Silvana Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 7640. A bill for the relief of Harry Dejur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7641. A bill for the relief of Rose Kovacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 7642. A bill for the relief of Sister Fara (Giuseppina Perrone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Space Law and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the publication next month by Appleton-Century-Crofts of a most important book, "Space Law and Government," by Andrew G. Haley.

I have known Mr. Haley for many years, having served with him in the military during the Second World War. He is an author, scientist, and lawyer. He is outstanding in the field of communications law and possesses the finest of credentials to offer what is to my knowledge the first comprehensive study on space law and Government.

"Space Law and Government" examines the role of intergovernmental and nongovernmental agencies in focusing attention on scientific and legal aspects of space exploration, and proposes guides for their future contribution.

I have had the privilege of reading part of Mr. Haley's manuscript for "Space Law and Government." In the

accurate words of his publisher, Mr. Haley's scientific and legal points are "definitely made, thoroughly authenticated, and represent a panoramic synthesis of the clearest thinking on space law, Government, and the relationship that should exist between the two."

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that "Space Law and Government" will be a major contribution to our emerging space age. Mr. Haley has devoted to the preparation of this work a matchless integrity and years of research and exhaustive study of the legal and sociological aspects of space flight.

I am personally awaiting the publication of "Space Law and Government" with great anticipation, and I commend this work to my colleagues with confidence.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 100 million people in Europe who are kept in captivity be-

hind the iron curtain of Communist totalitarianism. A wall in Berlin stands in silent testimony to the Soviet policy of inhumane slavery and of complete subjugation of mind and body to the state. The Communists are sadly mistaken if they feel, like the ostrich with his head in the sand, that the free world can be shielded from the facts of Red oppression by an iron curtain or a brick wall.

An effective American foreign policy should include discussions of Soviet colonialism in the United Nations. Just as Premier Khrushchev was not reluctant to bang his shoe at the United Nations, the United States should not be afraid to hammer the truth about captive nations in the General Assembly. Secondly, the United States must continue and expand our worldwide information programs to expose Communist desecration of human rights and liberties. Thirdly, Congress should establish a special Committee on Captive Nations which would give special attention to the moral and legal status of Communist control over nations and peoples. The Committee would devote its energies toward finding means by which the United States might assist these nations by peaceful processes. The gathering of facts about Communist tyranny would serve as a hard-hitting weapon to explode the myths of Communist unity and Soviet humanitarianism.

The captive peoples of the world properly look to the United States for help and guidance. The aim of this three-pronged program is to give heart to the brave people held in captivity, in the broadest sense of the word, in countries such as Poland, Armenia, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, and Hungary. The heroic uprisings against the Communist terrorists in Poland, East Germany, and Hungary are proof that the spirit of freedom cannot be chained and confined for long.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee."

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the RECORD.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Times, June 5, 1963]

WANTS COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD-TIMES:

Last January 9, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Public Law 86-90 of 1959 enumerates

22 captive nations under communism, such as: Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Georgia, and others. The proposed committee will handle all the matters concerning the captive nations and recommend peaceful means by which the United States can assist these nations to regain freedom.

More than 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for the passage of H.R. 14, including Massachusetts Congressmen JOHN W. MCCORMACK, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., JAMES A. BURKE, SILVIO O. CONTE, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, and F. BRADFORD MORSE.

Presently H.R. 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee. As with any other piece of legislation, the passage of the Flood resolution needs the widest public support.

Each of us can help the captive nations by writing letters to:

1. His Congressman, urging him to vote for the passage of H.R. 14 and,

2. Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging him to spur action on the proposed legislation.

The Flood resolution injects a powerful tool into our fight with communism. The proposed committee will bring to full light the true nature of the new Soviet colonialism.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., and to HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington. Urge them to vote for the passage of H.R. 14.

O. SZCZUDLUK,

Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Herald, June 9, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS BILL NEEDS SUPPORT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Last January 9 Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, to handle all matters concerning these nations and to recommend means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful means to regain freedom.

Over 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for H.R. 14, including Congressmen JOHN MCCORMACK, THOMAS O'NEILL, JAMES BURKE, SILVIO CONTE, PHILIP PHILBIN and BRADFORD MORSE.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman and to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging them to vote for H.R. 14.

O. SZCZUDLUK,

Director, Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

ARF APOVIAN COMMITTEE,

May 28, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Hollywood Apovian Committee of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation informs you that a resolution has been passed by our unit supporting passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15, submitted by you, which call for the formation of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

Recent developments worldwide and Washington make the formation of such a committee imperative to the security and welfare of the United States, and will bring added hope to the tyrannized peoples of the once free nations today in Soviet bondage.

We are, in addition to this letter, contacting our Congressman as well as Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, head of the Rules Committee, urging him to release your resolution to the House floor for quick debate and passage.

May we take this opportunity to commend you for your stand in this regard, and to assure you of our every support of your measure.

Sincerely,

ARTOOSH SATOORIAN,
Secretary, Hollywood Apovian Committee, ARF, Van Nuys, Calif.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., May 28, 1963.

Mr. WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. TUSTANIWSKY: Thank you for your communication of May 25 in regard to House Resolution 14.

I am pleased to advise you I am the sponsor of identical legislation to establish a special committee on the captive nations. A copy of my bill, House Resolution 196, is enclosed for your information.

You may be assured I shall continue to do all I can to have early and favorable consideration given this legislation.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS

COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,

Troy, N. Y., June 8, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The United States cannot afford to ignore the many nations enslaved by the Russian Communist tyranny, since these constitute a major weakness of the Soviet empire.

On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Troy, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) before your committee and give it your support.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a valuable source of information to our Government, especially in carrying out its foreign policy.

We therefore urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give the Flood resolution your careful consideration in your Rules Committee and support it.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM KUTZER,
Chairman of UCC of America,
Branch in Troy, N.Y.
IWAN DURBAK,
Secretary of UCCA
Branch in Troy, N.Y.

July Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the power preference bill has been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and soon will be considered on the floor of the House of Representa-

tives. Because of the importance of this legislation to the State of Washington and my congressional district, I have made it the subject of my July newsletter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newsletter, which contains a paragraph entitled "As I See It" as well as an explanation of the bill, in the RECORD.

POWER PREFERENCE

Although Congress is proceeding down the legislative trail at a snail's pace, there is some progress being made in the committees which doesn't make front-page news very often, but which can affect you considerably. One area of progress is the Pacific Northwest power preference legislation.

The power preference bill, as it is called, was introduced by Senator HENRY JACKSON, Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and myself. The Senate passed the bill and just last week the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, reported the bill to the House.

You might ask how this legislation could affect you. Well, it could affect your pocketbook. Second, it could affect the industrial future of the State of Washington.

As things stand now, Bonneville Power Administration, which markets all federally produced power in the Pacific Northwest, is falling behind in its repayment contracts at a rate of about \$15 million a year. This has been going on for several years. Not too long ago, BPA had a \$70 million surplus in the repayment kitty. Although Bonneville is still ahead \$20 million on its payments to the Treasury, power rates will have to be raised unless something is done soon. Otherwise Bonneville will use up the kitty and fall behind in its payments. Any rate increase to meet this situation could seriously affect the industrial future of the State and damage our economy.

Had BPA been able to market surplus power in past years, it would have been operating in the black instead of the red. Advances in transmission techniques, however, now make it possible to wheel this power economically all the way from the Columbia River to Los Angeles.

Under the present law, a municipal or public body gets first call on power produced at federally constructed powerplants. If a line were constructed between Bonneville and southern California, it would be quite possible for Los Angeles to demand firm power from Bonneville, which it would be compelled to deliver even if it had to take the power away from industry in the State of Washington.

My bill says, in essence, that customers in the Pacific Northwest would get first call on this power over any customer outside the area. Well, I've been accused of "building a Chinese wall," of "Balkanizing" and a lot of other things that aren't so nice. But, I got the bill through the committee nevertheless. I expect the bill to come before the House in 2 or 3 weeks where it will face a tough battle.

I also was able to put in an amendment which says in effect that the Secretary of Interior must get authorization from the Congress before he can build transmission lines from Bonneville to points outside the Pacific Northwest, under terms of this act.

Such a project might cost anywhere from \$125 to \$250 million, so it seems to me only right that the Secretary should come to Congress to justify his request for that much money. After all, they're your dollars. Also, Congress is supposed to control the purse strings. The Interior Committee supported my amendment 23 to 9. Yet, I've been accused of being "anti-Northwest," "anti-Southwest," and "antipublic interest."

What I'm really anti about is the spending of millions of dollars without congressional authorization. I hope you feel the same way.

Sincerely yours,
Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT
(By Helen Westland)

Have you ever wondered what sort of a conversation you might carry on if you found yourself sitting next to the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America? Imagine the broad range of subjects, such as the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, our astronauts, or our space program. Well, it happened to me the other night at a dinner. I was sitting to the right of Secretary McNamara. After giving it a little thought, I chose a subject I knew something about. Since he formerly was president of the Ford Motor Co., I asked him if he had ever heard of a Thunderbird mooing? I might just as well have asked him if he knew an atomic bomb was going to be dropped on Washington. He looked speechless, but reacted quickly by asking just exactly what I meant. I told him our car, when it was new a couple of years ago, made a noise that sounded just like a cow mooing. We finally found out it was the result of a faulty plastic bushing. He looked relieved to know the answer, and I had a rather satisfying feeling that I was better informed on one little thing than our Secretary of Defense.

Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Washington Post of July 2, 1963:

STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

I was amazed at the misstatement in Walter Lippman's article, "Free and Associated Puerto Rico," in your issue of June 18, that "Puerto Ricans * * * do not vote in elections outside of Puerto Rico."

Puerto Ricans coming to the mainland can and do vote in any State of the Union where they establish legal residence. They can then vote for all local, State, and National officials, including the President and Vice President of the United States. Thousands have done it in New York and elsewhere.

The article contains other errors. "Federal legislation," writes Mr. Lippmann, "apart from tax legislation may be, but need not be, applied to Puerto Rico. This includes Federal grants-in-aid, though usually Congress does make them applicable."

All Federal legislation applies to Puerto Rico except the tax laws. Uncle Sam has generously relieved Puerto Rico of all Federal taxes and even the customs receipts are covered into the Puerto Rican Treasury. Only one modification in the uniform applicability of all other Federal legislation took place in the administrative procedure of the minimum wage law.

As for the grants-in-aid, the unvarying custom to date has been to include with the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, although Congress could, of course, change that in any given piece of legislation.

Nor is it correct to say, as Mr. Lippmann does, that if "a compact of permanent union is authorized by Congress and is ratified by a

referendum of the Puerto Rican people, it will establish a union which neither country can unilaterally dissolve."

Granted that there might be and could be a moral obligation for Congress to adhere to such an arrangement if once authorized, no Congress can bind its successors, and there would be no constitutional authority for such a commitment. Only a constitutional amendment would establish "such a union which neither country could unilaterally dissolve."

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska.

WASHINGTON.

CommOnism and Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in the United States today for whom I have greater admiration than Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina.

He is, I believe, one of the great men of our time.

In a recent newsletter to his constituents, the Senator, with a bare 500 words or so, incisively cut to the heart of the major decision facing, not only the Congress, but each individual in the Nation: do we, as a nation, choose commonness and conformity or do we choose, as we have traditionally chosen, the right to remain individuals.

All other questions before us waste to nothingness in comparison to this one. The answer we give will effect us for yet a thousand years. We are standing on the razor's edge of time. I cannot tell if the hour is midnight or if it is already Zero-Zero-Zero-One.

If there is still precious time left for us to make our own decision, I urge all my colleagues to read first the masterful summation in Senator THURMOND's newsletter before making that decision:

COMMONISM AND CONFORMITY

The age of individualism, when America forged its claim to greatness largely because of the independence and initiative of the individual, is gradually but significantly slipping from the scene. Individualism and independence have been replaced in large part with commonism and conformity, as a result of a determined effort to level all men and nation-states to a common plane in life.

Individualism is the belief in the importance of the individual. Jesus Christ ordained the preeminence of the individual in his teachings, and the Founding Fathers of this country wrote this idea into the Constitution, principally into the Bill of Rights which set out specific guarantees of protection for the individual against the power of the central government. The founders realized that the individual would not last long in the new world they had settled, unless the ruling authorities were tied down, as Jefferson suggested, by the "chains of the Constitution."

Early in the 19th century, the wretched and depraved mind of Karl Marx stole a few economic and social theories and merged them together, to give birth to a new "ism" called commUnism. According to Marx, his

aim was to establish an ideal world, in which each would "give according to his ability and receive according to his needs." It would, of course, be necessary to first establish a world dictatorship to bring about this worthy goal. Once established, however, this would evolve into an age called the millennium, when governmental authority would wither away and all the commoners would work together without discipline or authority, to share the wealth of the world.

A dispute then developed within the ranks of communism as to how this end should be attained. Some demanded revolution; others wanted to adopt the tactics of the Roman general Fabius Maximus, who supposedly conceived the military tactic of gradualism in wearing down the enemy. The gradualists, or fabians, as they have become known, have been particularly successful in commonizing the British Empire during this century, playing a significant part in the decline of this once-great empire. Unfortunately for America, the germ of communism spread from Britain to America, with particular vigor, within the past few decades.

The idea of "communism" is particularly noticeable today in American Government, with its paternalistic programs of aid and control. This paternalistic attitude has encouraged Negro leaders to make statements that they are seeking "a compensatory preferential highway" and that "the word equality has to be broadened." They are even making such rash and bold statements as: "America has to change its entire posture. I think it is an inevitable move toward some kind of socialism."

Today Americans will conform to central dictation not only because of the use of mass means of propaganda techniques and the habit which conformity breeds, but also because of the club of coercion which accompanies each "gimme" from the group or Government. Nowhere is the air of conformity felt stronger than in party and power politics in Washington. At the center of Government, there is little room for individualism or independence, and there is much power available to buy off or club down too many acts of independent action on the part of the individual public servant.

The day of the individualist is passing, and unfortunately, it is fading fast in the Halls of the Congress, where it ought to last longest if independence is to be preserved for every individual American. Unwarranted criticism by many Members of Congress, of their own institution, is adding to this downgrading of the legislative branch. Official Washington, influenced by its own propaganda, is under the false impression that the American people desire "communism" even with its features of conformity and control, rather than their right to be an individual and independent of unnecessary regulation and control.

By and large, the American people still agree with the Jeffersonian idea "that Government is best, which governs least."

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Colmer Predicts Hard Fight on President's Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, when the President sent his new civil rights

proposals to the Congress, the dean of my State's delegation, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, issued a statement predicting a long, hot summer on Capitol Hill.

My colleague, who has served with four Presidents in the course of his more than 30 years in the Congress, knows whereof he speaks. He is a wise and seasoned legislator and an able one.

In order to share his thoughts on these drastic proposals with the other Members of this body, I include below Mr. COLMER's statement:

Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER, dean of the Mississippi congressional delegation, today predicted a long summer, extending possibly to Thanksgiving Day, on the President's new proposal for civil rights. He said:

"I am confident that most Members of both the North and the South, Democrats and Republicans, would prefer to have no part of it. But the power of the Presidency, the Justice Department and the Negro bloc-vote appeal are powerful weapons.

"The administration has created a Frankenstein and is now hollering, 'wolf.' In fact, those responsible for the present racial unrest are even appealing to their pet whipping boy, the South, and their traditional enemy, the Republicans, to bail them out.

"We are told that we are faced with a revolution. What politicians, do-gooders and radical Negro leaders refuse to recognize is that the racial problem is one of evolution and not of revolution.

"The Negro race has made the greatest progress in this country that any race has ever made in a similar period of time. This has been accomplished under the guiding and helping hand of his white brother, particularly his southern white brother. He cannot be brought up overnight on a plane with the white race which has had the benefit of civilization, Christianity, and education for more than 2,000 years. He must tread the same slow path which has characterized the advancement of the white race.

"There are already ample and adequate laws on the books to protect the rights of all minority groups. No amount of appeasement, no law or no court decree can or will solve the problem.

"The President's proposals are more far-reaching than his stated objective of equal rights for Negroes. The racial angle is but one facet of the evils proposed. These new civil wrongs advocated by the administration strike at the very foundation stones of our system of constitutional Government.

"The enactment of the President's recommendations can only result in:

"1. The further tragic breakdown of good relations between the races.

"2. A step-up in more and more demands by the Negro agitators.

"3. More regimentation of the American people by a strong centralized Federal Government, with the resultant deprivations of the liberties of all American citizens.

"4. A further significant, if not fatal, assault upon the free enterprise system and the death knell of State sovereignty.

"5. The end of the one-party system in the South.

"These unwise and unconstitutional requests, with all of their dangerous implications, should be recognized by all Americans for what they are. They are purely political and should be treated as such. They are reminiscent of reconstruction days when the prostrated people of the South were governed by the carpetbaggers and the bayonet.

"While this is a national problem, our Southern Representatives in both the House and the Senate should take the lead in opposing these new and drastic assaults upon constitutional Government as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Because of recent in-

cidents in other sections of the country, it is possible that help may come from these sources. The South is historically the defender of States rights and sovereignty. It is also the greatest potential political minority in the country. Its Representatives in the Congress must make this final effort to close the ranks and, oblivious to party alignment and self-aggrandizement, say like the Spartans of old, 'They shall not pass.'"

Congressman Miller on Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the American people, the excellent comments of the gentleman from California, Congressman MILLER, on the development of the U.S. space programs under two administrations. It is a great credit to the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER's leadership, that as far as the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress is concerned, there are as yet no politics in space. The 1964 authorization bill has been reported unanimously. I repeat unanimously, by the entire House Committee on Science and Astronautics of 31 members, after exhaustive hearings, personal checks at space installations, and 3,000 pages of testimony and careful questioning.

The comments follow:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO THE NATIONAL ROCKET CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON JULY 16, 1963.

I am pleased indeed to be with you today. It is always a pleasure for me to speak before the National Rocket Club, because in a true sense, we meet here as members of our national space team. We are all trying to contribute in some measure directly or indirectly to the great surging human effort we have committed to achieving success in peacefully exploring space. I think we share also a sense of dedication to a national purpose that exemplifies to the world as never before what this country is and what it stands for.

In looking back over the years since 1958, we have seen in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an agency that, to put it mildly, has experienced a rate of growth which has truly been unprecedented in our history. Beginning with a budget of something more than \$300 million and 8,000 employees transferred from the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, today, 5 years later it will be budgeted with considerably more than \$5 billion and have 30,000 employees.

And this growth has been justified beyond question by the more than 100 unmanned satellites we have orbited, by the flights of the astronauts and by the great impetus almost every aspect of our national society has received. We have had the opportunity, through such programs as Tiros, Telstar, and Relay to demonstrate the promise in these early years of the tremendous benefits from space exploration that can help in no small measure the attainment of a peaceful world.

I know you have heard the same convictions expressed by many different people and in many different ways. But the choice of semantics does not make these convictions any less the unchangeable articles of faith under which we have taken the first infant steps to explore the universe that surrounds us.

I have reiterated these beliefs if only to underscore the realization that we have reached with the conclusion of Project Mercury and the undertaking of the Gemini program the first rung, if you will, of the spaceladder.

We have reached the point where congressional assessment of our space program is beginning to assume new perspectives. We have arrived at a level of experience which can give a clearer and more cogent evaluation of the resources that will be needed to carry forward NASA programs, particularly with regard to manned space flight.

As no doubt most of you already know, my committee concluded only a few days ago months of intense and exhaustive deliberations on the authorization of NASA's fiscal year 1964 budget. Actually, the committee and its subcommittees held more than 75 open and closed hearings. They heard from more than 100 witnesses, both military and civilian, which resulted in more than 3,000 pages of printed testimony, and they traveled the length and breadth of the country to determine at firsthand NASA's needs.

In all my experience in the House of Representatives, I know of no other committee whose members have expended more effort, often at personal expense, inconvenience, and often discomfort, than have those of my committee, in the evaluation of this year's space budget. And the results bear this out.

I should point out that the action of the committee was voted unanimously. But unanimity was not achieved without honest disagreement, not without soul-searching, and certainly not without a willingness of the members to adjust and compromise their views. I also want the record to show that at no time did partisanship or party interests play any part in influencing committee decision. Of that fact I am very proud.

I would suppose that the actions taken by my committee would provide some measure of satisfaction to the somewhat vocal critics in and out of government who have attacked the tempo of and indeed the need for the space program, or who have said that only the military has a role to play in space.

I would say that these critics suffer from a form of myopia that has resulted from an inability to raise their eyes from the road immediately ahead which prevents the recognition of facts and truth beyond the limits of their blurred vision.

First of all, the resources we are assigning to our national space program are well within our capacity to provide. We are not paying anywhere near the price for space exploration that is being paid by the average Soviet citizen to orbit Sputniks and Vostoks.

He is paying in terms of more bread on his table, better shoes on his feet, and less expensive clothes on his back.

I know of no evidence today that technological innovations developed by the Soviet space program is being fed back directly into Russia's economy to make life a little easier for her citizens.

Here, as you well know, it's a completely different story. Apart from the immediate value of the space program to the Nation and to the industrial community, it would be well for us at this time to review and to remind ourselves of the indirect but no less important benefits we are reaping.

To me, the most important indirect benefit we are gaining is probably the least tangible, the least measurable, and yet the most far reaching in effect insofar as our future national growth is concerned. I am referring to the impact our space program is having upon our educational programs and institutions. The fact that NASA places demands upon and draws from almost every academic discipline has produced a stimulus in universities and colleges that is unprecedented in peacetime.

In terms of dollars, my committee has authorized the expenditure of \$18 million for facilities grants, \$25 million for training grants, and \$12 million for research grants—a total of \$55 million. This is in addition to the direct contracts for research, development and design NASA will make with institutions of advanced learning throughout the country.

Can you think of any other investment that will have as far reaching and as beneficial an effect? I don't think you can.

In this age of international technological competition, our very survival in the years to come will depend literally upon the quality and the scholastic achievement of men and women we are training now. If our space program can materially contribute to our continued strength and leadership, then surely that can be a major justification for every cent Congress will appropriate for this effort.

Let us consider NASA's program for the dissemination of information, which, by the way, is a statutory requirement in the space act of 1958. I don't have to describe in detail to you what this program has done for our international prestige, especially in the scientific communities around the world.

I can speak from firsthand knowledge gained from personal contact with scientific and technical leaders both here and in Europe that world respect for American technology, as a direct result of our space program, has been enhanced many times over.

I am sure you recall the shock of Sputnik I and the effect it had upon our technical leadership in the eyes of people everywhere. Further, no one would question the fact that our political leadership of the Western World is based upon recognition and acceptance of our technological superiority.

Sputnik I was a very severe threat to that leadership. NASA's information program has been a major factor in reaffirming that leadership over the past 5 years. Believe me, it has been an investment that has paid off for us many times over.

The technological advances that have evolved from NASA research and development activities have implications to American industry and economy that are really beyond accurate evaluation. The indirect benefits that have already come and those of the future, however, have a real meaning for all of us.

It is important to realize that the United States is in international competition today with countries whose industries, especially those of Japan, France, and Germany, were either destroyed by the Allies, or were stripped to the bone by the Nazi war machine. The rebuilding of these nations, largely financed by us, has resulted in industrial complexes that are, for the most part, relatively new, based upon new plants, new equipment, and new processes.

It is obvious, therefore, that these factors, coupled with a much lower wage level than ours, could seriously affect our ability to compete for world markets, especially when our industrial base could not be renovated.

However, the evolution of our space industry, made possible by work already done in rocketry by the Armed Forces, demanded a response from industry that has resulted in a resurgence of technical ingenuity. Our

space industry is our new industry, if you will. It is providing a new base from which, through achievements in research and development, we can compete with newer and better products.

This is an indirect benefit of major significance that is growing in dimension and impact on the general level. The specific benefits, too, are being pinpointed by NASA's office of industrial applications. The translation of NASA discoveries or innovations into useful economic tools is benefiting our people of almost every walk of life.

I can't think of any other aspect of our space program that could better justify our space expenditures to the average taxpayer than industrial applications. Here is the tangible evidence that he is getting something in return for his investment. His return will be a wide variety of new or better products, at reasonable cost, which in turn will give rise to greater consumer demand and economic stimulus.

I am not going to dwell upon the obvious import to our national economy that the \$5 billion NASA budget represents. The fact that 90 percent of the money appropriated will be expended through contracts with private industry speaks for itself.

What is important to understand is that scientific research and development is for the first time in our peacetime history being organized within one agency to accomplish a national goal. The achievements of our immediate space objectives are, of course, of paramount importance. But, I have little patience with the critics who cry out that our tax money is being thrown away in the exploration of space, or that going to the moon will result in the neglect of our problems here on earth.

It should be obvious to those critics, if they take the time for a short historical review, that many years of experience have shown that the indirect payoff in human terms for technical innovation is many times more valuable than the original investment.

If our efforts in the astronautics disciplines result in the improvement of the health of our people through greater knowledge of human anatomy, that alone could provide a major justification for our space expenditures.

If, by diverting national energies into the peaceful exploration of space, the nations of the world could avoid a cataclysmic war, then that alone is worth many times the cost.

If, by sending men into space, we can discover new and far reaching facts that can contribute to the elimination of hunger and abject poverty from the less favored portions of our globe, then that alone is worth the price that we, along with others, are paying.

It is not possible to review for you all of the indirect benefits we are garnering from our space program. I am sure that many of you here could probably cite in much more intimate detail than I can many instances of space technology that have been translated into daily use in business and industry.

The point is this: We are a highly integrated people. Any national effort we undertake, such as our space program, will affect directly every aspect of our national community, and will have to some degree an impact on every individual.

Our space program is in the hands of men of outstanding ability and patriotism, whose driving motivation is to bend every effort possible to fulfill the guiding principle of the 1958 Space Act, "that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

I think the record shows that we have been true to our ideals. And you, and I, and our children will live in a better, more secure world because we have done so.